THE New Republic

China Policy—
The Boat Must
Be Rocked

Pages 3-4

Voting Record of The 85th Congress

Dixie, My Dixie . . . . . *Gerald W. Johnson*

Wilder, But Not Funnier . . *Stanley Kauffmann*

Maine Casts Its Shadow . . . . *Louis H. Bean*

The Whitney Show . . . . . *Frank Getlein*

Silone's Power of Example . . . *Irving Howe*

SEPTEMBER 22, 1958

25 cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Wire

Those Pressed Violets

AH ME, what an idyll it was, that ride across America in crisp fall weather! It was a romance, a love affair, with the American people. The air was like wine over the prairie towns of isolationist Illinois; the adoring crowds came out not so much to hear as to see the candidate. This reporter was on the 1952 Eisenhower train, again today that smell of burning autumn leaves brings it all back.

At Peoria there were samples of lover's pledges. "My goal," he said simply, "is to cut Federal spending to something like $60 billions within four years . . ." (Anticipated 1959 expenditure: $79.2 billion). "Such a cut," he added, "would eliminate the deficit . . ." (Anticipated 1959 deficit: $12.5 billions, largest in peacetime.)

The crowds spiritually fondled their hero—and he responded in turn. Surely this was not artifice: in his uncomplicated creed all problems yielded to goodwill and he was a man of goodwill. To farmers and other groups he promised "fair play"—his Kasson pledge of full 100 percent parity put the engagement ring on the agricultural vote. (Parity didn't quite work out that way and of course in 1958 farm surpluses are higher now than ever.)

But with what sturdy terms he everywhere denounced Democratic inflation: (it is true, of course, that the cost-of-living has made a new all-time high each month now for ever so long). I remember those days of exhilaration and ecstasy. How good and simple he made it all. The Democrats were the party of wars, he said, but "America's goal is peace. The Republican party's goal is peace!" They all cheered that.

On that particular day (Oct. 2) the special train rumbled into Champaign, Ill., a region still isolationist in sentiment. The placable leader easily adjusted himself. Boys were dying in Korea. "We must avoid," he admonished, "the kind of bungling that led us into Korea and could lead us into others. The young farm boys must stay on their farms; the students must stay in their schools."

This man would never lead the nation to the brink! He reproved the Democrats—

"We are waging a war far from our shores . . . We do not want Asia to feel that the white man of the West is his enemy. If there must be a war there, let it be Asians against Asians!"

You could see the wave of enthusiasm move across the face of the happy, outdoor crowd.

After Champaign came Peoria. That night GOP chairman Summerfield (now PMG) brought to the Pere Marquette hotel room the Junior Senator, prior to the morrow's journey across Wisconsin. We can only speculate on the felicitations at this edifying meeting from which, after an hour, Senator McCarthy emerged beaming to declare that he had had a "very, very pleasant conversation."

Lucky the party that has flexibility in its leadership! It was after this gracious visit that our hero eliminated from the text of his next day's speech at Milwaukee the praise of his benefactor, George C. Marshall—a man whom McCarthy charged was tainted with disloyalty.

Back to Reality

PUT the hallowed clippings back in their yellowed cardfiles. Some fragrances are too precious to lose. What if the pledges were not all carried out—what lovers' vows ever again are? Rather let that American Idyll be an unspoiled memory for us all, to be evoked again each fall—of a smiling Hero, a rapturous nation and the dream music-obbligato of the dewy-eyed press. File the old speeches away on the fiction shelf under "Love Romances," subhead, "Asians against Asians," and mark down AD 1952 as being as far away from us in time as Queen Victoria, or the Age of Innocence.

Coming back with difficulty to reality, let us record these points on the contemporary scene.

Democrats are so confident of the fall election, after Maine, that in many areas they are not troubling too much about candidates, passing over Thomas Finletter for senator in New York, for example. Why dress up the window if the customer will buy anyway?

Democrats still can't believe Eisenhower will retain Sherman Adams, but pinch themselves with hope.

Ol' Debil Reuther

THE REAL hatred of conservatives in the labor movement is not Hoffa, or corruption, it is Walter Reuther. Hoffa is the conservatives' "Sherman Adams" in trade unions. But they hate Reuther because he is shrewd, successful and incorruptible. This explains why a typical group of rich Republicans has been buying vicious anti-Reuther pamphlets for circulation in behalf of Knowland in California. The leaflet as exposed in the *New York Times* is called "Meet the Man Who Plans to Rule America" and describes Reuther as Marxist, Socialist and pro-Communist. It is prepared by well-known pseudo-fascist Joe Kamp, who served one jail sentence for contempt and caused the late Senator Taft to declare that he was "particularly disgusted" with Kamp's writings. It is sad to see what respectable people still buy his wares.

In 1956 the US mobilized a UN vote of 47-24 (with 8 abstentions) against Red China's admission; last year it was 47 to 27 (with 7 abstentions). This year —? Well, we shall learn this week as the UN re-assembles how many Latin American republics and similar clients we can rely upon. But our big allies are stirring uneasily at "Dulles' folly." We can still certainly keep the world's largest nation out of UN, but it is becoming increasingly difficult.

For those of us at home who have opposed the Quemoy fiction from the first and who are now caught with Dulles on his bombarded brink, the moral dilemma comes to a showdown. "Appeasers!" Eisenhower calls us. And the old slogan reappears, "Silence—you're aiding the Communists." We don't know what your answer is but ours is simple. Nerts.

T.R.B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic
A JOURNAL OF OPINION

1244 19TH ST., N.W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

VOL. 139, NO. 12, ISSUE 2288
SEPTEMBER 22, 1958

THE WEEK 3

Just for Quemoy; Rocking the Boat; Faubus and Almond; The New Nixon; T. R. to W. H. Taft; Moderation Overboard; When the Marines Go; Verbatimese

ARTICLES 8

Maine Casts Its Shadow
by Louis H. Bean

This Congress and the Next

The 85th Congress

BOOKS 18

MOVIES 20

ART 22

TELEVISION 23

GILBERT A. HARRISON, *Editor & Publisher*
MICHAEL STRAIGHT, *Editor-at-Large*
HELEN FULLER, *Managing Editor*
SELIG S. HARRISON, *Associate Editor*
ROBERT EVETT, *Book & Music Editor*
F. R. Ruskin, *Asst. to the Publisher*
Contributing Editors: Alexander M. Bickel, B. H. Haggin, Irving Howe, Gerald W. Johnson, James E. King, Jr., Donald Malcolm, Helen Hill Miller

Published weekly (except for omissions of four summer issues) and distributed to newsstands by the Eastern News Company, N. Y. 14, N. Y. Phone: REpublic 7-8656. Entered as second-class matter September 26, 1950, at the post office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Single copy, 25¢; Yearly subscription, $8.00; Foreign, $9.00. Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Please include both old and new addresses. Copyright, 1958, by Harrison-Blaine, Inc.

A Communication

► *Film Censorship in Los Angeles?*

SIRS:

BOTH California and Los Angeles lawmakers have manifested a critical interest lately in what has been going on at local art movie houses. Over the Labor Day weekend I attended an invitational unreeling of some film which may soon

(Continued on page 24)

Just for Quemoy

> NOW I ASSURE you that no American boy would ever be asked by me to fight just for Quemoy. But those who make up our armed forces—and I believe the American people as a whole—do stand ready to defend the principle that armed force shall not be used for aggressive purposes.
>
> DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, *September 11, 1958*

WE CONFESS we are appalled at the chasm that yawns below the brink to which the Administration has brought us this time. Moreover, we do not take it kindly that the President should try to justify his mismanagement by appeals to principle. There may indeed be no war. But the chance that we shall get out of this debacle peacefully is certainly not better than 50-50, which is an inordinate risk to run in a conflict that, if it comes, will find us without major allies and divided and uncertain among ourselves.

We have labored with our conscience to decide whether, by raising our voice in protest, we shall be guilty of "aiding the enemy." There are, we agree, moments when there is no alternative but a gathering of the herd and a lowering of horns against the threatening wolf pack. But we have long protested, as have many Americans, the deadly and dangerous end toward which the Administration's China policy was leading us. We shall rally 'round, along with our fellow Americans, if the worst comes to pass, but we shall do so objecting still to the absurdity of taking our stand in a field we ourselves have baited for the attacking wolves.

We have heard a great deal these last few weeks about the "world order" we now find ourselves pledged to defend. This "world order," we have been told, in an over-simplification of cosmic proportions no doubt befitting the space age, lies in one principle: "that armed force shall not be used for aggressive purposes," or as Secretary Dulles expressed it on September 4, "that armed force should not be used to achieve territorial ambitions." The world is today dominated by two great powers: both were born of armed revolt; throughout the span of their lives there has not been half a decade in which somewhere armed force has not been used "for aggressive purposes," including the achievement of "territorial ambitions." Yet now, all of a sudden, we are asked by our leaders to believe that violence can and must be banished from history. How? By our threat of violence.

Once again in this situation we see the same infatuation with nuclear military force we have so long deplored. For if General Eisenhower really believes he can succeed where Canute failed, it must be because he believes he has something more than words to hurl at the waves. But the limits of the force we can and will employ are demonstrated by one truce line that divides Korea and another that divides Viet-Nam.

When one boldly draws a thus-far-and-no-farther line on a map, it must be understood that it cannot be drawn irrespective of political

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realities. The President speaks of a Far Eastern Munich, but simply calling something a Munich doesn't make it one. Benès was the peaceable leader of a sovereign state that had no designs on Germany: who is the counterpart of Benès and what is Germany in the Formosa Straits? For good and legitimate reasons a policy can be declared and defended as in the case of Korea—even at the cost of violence. But can we really presume to banish from history everyone's violence but our own?

☆

The tragedy of the situation in the Formosa Straits is that a number of things have become entangled—one or two of which do command national support and some sympathy from friendly powers, but others of which cannot pass the most elementary tests of prudence. Thus the right to self-determination for Formosa might well command the sympathy if not the explicit support of most UN members, and a neutral Formosa would both offer us an alternative to the humiliation of a Communist Formosa and reserve an oasis of non-Communist Chinese intellectual life in Asia. But our current policy cannot be presented in the name of self-determination or of any principle other than equivocal opposition to violence, linked in an incompatible union with a commitment to one side in the remnant of a civil war. In the "opinion of mankind" the Chinese civil war is over; it is the United States, not China, that finds itself isolated so long as Washington does not manifest a decent respect for that opinion.

Meanwhile, whatever worth there is in our determination to prevent a Communist take-over of Formosa has been prejudiced by our long-run commitment to the proposition that the Communist regime on the mainland is a temporary evil—and by a short-run commitment to the defense of offshore islands for which the justification sought to be proffered is that their possession by the regime of Chiang Kai-shek may reduce the life span of Communist China.

We can hold these offshore islands against Red China only by main force. The argument that they are not a part of Red China because they have never been under Communist control is about as convincing as would have been a British assertion of the right to retain Manhattan Island and Long Island because, having been under Tory control and British occupation on July 4, 1776, they "had never been" a part of the United States. Quemoy controls the entrances to Amoy harbor, while the Kuomintang forces on Matsu can bottle up the harbor of Foochow. What kind of a "world order" is it in which two major ports of a great power must lie at the mercy of hostile (even if not actively aggressive) armed forces within light artillery range?

Pure, naked force it is, then, and when we first guaranteed Chiang's security during the Korean War, we unquestionably had such force. Indeed, up to that time Chiang had been able to defend himself, and to hold the offshore islands without our help. But the situation has radically changed. Red Chinese military power, not to mention Russia's, has been growing relative to ours at least since 1953, while our atomic stockpile is no longer an ace-in-the-hole we can count on to outbid the Sino-Soviet hand. We have been increasing our commitments, taking more territory, and more exposed territory, under our protective wing even as our capacity to defend—or deter—has been declining.

Maybe the Communist powers are bluffing again this time, as they did previously in 1954-1955, before they were capable of making a real fight of it. But sooner or later they will stop bluffing, and if we are going to salvage anything from our China policy (even a neutral Formosa), we must recognize, as we argued two weeks ago in these pages, that the military premises for our China policy are no longer valid. Even without the prospective change in the over-all balance of military power, our current China policy will be militarily obsolete and politically untenable the moment the Chinese are known for certain to possess nuclear weapons.

☆

One can argue, as defenders of our current policy do, that the Chinese Communists themselves would be the losers in Asian eyes should they ever initiate military action to regain Formosa, and that their aggression would justify our response—even with nuclear weapons. But the miserable reality is that a nuclear showdown over Formosa would inevitably polarize Asian opinion against the United States. For the US to use nuclear weapons against Asians once again—in a conflict between rival Asian interests—would be to abandon any claim we have to moral leadership in Asia, if not also in the Middle East and Black Africa. Our China policy, as formulated now, is not worth the risks and inevitable costs of a nuclear war.

When, in short, Louis J. Halle declares in these pages that our China policy amounts to "waiting for disaster," we do not believe he exaggerates. Our only hope for the present lies in talking and talking, while we play for time in which to shift to a new China policy—to begin to offer implicit acknowledgements of our "recognition" of Peking which can ultimately permit the explicit step of diplomatic recognition. If we are not at war one month from now it would not be too soon for Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson—the symbol of our difficulties—to retire to his porch in Virginia. If we are in war, we shall have to find what comfort we can in the President's assurance that our boys are not dying "just for Quemoy."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rocking the Boat

GOING THROUGH some correspondence files this week, we came across the reply we received in June, 1956, to a letter we had written a leading Republican publisher asking for his views on China policy. In our invitation, we had noted the absence of serious discussion "in any magazine, newspaper or journal on the China question which advances us one bit beyond our present impossible situation," and observed that we were still hoping to find "anyone prominent in political life, whether in or out of Congress, who either has any new ideas on our China policy or who is willing to express them publicly."

The publisher's reply makes fascinating reading today. His letter, marked CONFIDENTIAL, granted the need for "recognizing the inevitability of the admission of Communist China to the UN, if the UN is to survive in its present form, and in letting the public know that fact."

"The critics of the Administration," he added, "have been equally culpable because, so far as I know, no Democratic leader has spoken up in a forthright manner in opposition to the Administration's China policy."

But his letter ended with the plea that *The New Republic* take into account "the time element." It would be better, he urged, to wait to discuss these matters in print until the election is over:

> Once the election is out of the way, I would guess that the President or Secretary of State, regardless of his party, would begin to drop hints that perhaps China's admission to the UN was inevitable. I think that the ensuing protests then would not be as serious as they would be now, and probably within a matter of months Red China would be admitted to the UN.

So much for prophecy.

What can one say, two years later and in all charity, about the silence in high places which has helped to bring about our present highly dangerous and futile involvement? We can indeed say that the Democratic leadership bears a terrible responsibility, for it has out of fear or ignorance surrendered its right and duty to criticize the Administration's futile commitment to Chiang; it is this failure which makes its responsibility today that much more difficult to fulfil. Don't "rock the boat"? The boat *must* be rocked, so that the passengers understand that perilous seas surround us. It is in moments of crisis, *before* the nation is irretrievably committed to war —small or large—that discussion is needed. Dean Acheson has set the standard for responsible comment in his brilliant and to us irrefutable analysis of the inconsistency and impracticality of the Administration's China policy. Let other Democrats do likewise. Silence in the presence of the disastrous diplomacy of Secretary Dulles is genuinely subversive of the deepest national interest.

"Gosh, It's Nearly Time for the Closing of Schools"

Faubus and Almond

THE SUPREME COURT has spoken, and we are back where we started in Little Rock and in Virginia. The summer-long crisis of litigation was a simulated affair, a wound self-inflicted by the District Court in Little Rock. There was never any real doubt concerning resolution of this crisis.

Now again it is appropriate to point out that no one is trying to ram a revolution down the South's throat. No one is trying to exact obedience to orders issued in a spirit of vindictivenesses. No one is striking a holier-than-thou attitude. Let the colloquies between Mr. Butler, representing the Little Rock School Board, and every member of the Supreme Court of the United States bear witness to that. A start is required, only a start, and that not everywhere. A handful of children in a handful of schools. It will be a very long time before anyone expects the South to have solved the problem to the extent that it has been solved in the City of New York, where of course it is not solved yet, for it is a problem common to most of the Nation, differing only in degree from place to place.

In the face of this invasion of handfuls—7 children here, 17 there—Mr. Faubus in Little Rock, Governor Almond in Warren County, Va., act to close schools. We cannot believe that the respective communities will toler-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ate such self-disfigurement for long. In any event, the federal government, which is profoundly in the right, legally and morally, has no choice but to stand its ground against school closings as against violence.

The New Nixon

STUDENTS of the new Nixon should study the text of a speech their man made recently to a conference of the Harvard Business School Association. In it, Mr. Nixon gave the most complete outline currently available of his economic views. On taxes, he recommended reduction in corporate levies, more generous depreciation allowances, diminished progression in personal income taxes and a 1.5 percent manufacturers' excise levy—the more dignified name for a general sales tax. Although he opposed wage control—and also price control—he placed the major blame for inflation on the excessive demands of labor unions. Their leaders, in Mr. Nixon's opinion, should not press for wage increases which "force price increases." In all of this Mr. Nixon represents an unchanged conservatism, and in his tax policy he is extremely close to the opinions which have long been controversial staples of the National Association of Manufacturers, a group which looks longingly at the golden age when only consumers paid taxes.

If the main thrust of Mr. Nixon's thought is still conservative, it is also true that he has added the embellishments we have come to expect. He does not favor, as many conservatives do, applying the anti-trust laws to trade union activity. And he advocates extending the duration and the amount of unemployment compensation benefits. Nevertheless, here is a traditional conservative program which favors the producer interest, supports prosperity primarily by favoring business, and exhibits tender solicitude for the large taxpayer. Unless liberalism has changed its meaning, Mr. Nixon remains a conservative.

T. R. to W. H. Taft

THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S personal correspondence, now on exhibit in the main rotunda of the Library of Congress, includes this letter to William Howard Taft, then Republican Presidential nominee, written from Oyster Bay on White House stationery:

Strictly Private *September 5, 1908*

DEAR WILL,

I do not want this letter to be seen by anyone but you and Mrs. Taft. It does not seem to me that the National Committee is accomplishing quite as much as it should. DuPont's connection with the speakers' committee has done far-reaching harm, especially in the West. It may be that it is too late to do anything about this, but if he should retire now I cannot help feeling that some of the damage would be undone.

I believe you are entirely right about the wisdom of making a few speeches in just the terms you mention. You should put yourself prominently and emphatically in this campaign. Also I hope to see everything done henceforth to give the impression that you are working steadily in the campaign. It seems absurd, but I am convinced that the prominence that has been given to your golf-playing has not been wise, and from now on I hope your people will prevent one word being sent out about either your fishing or your playing golf. The American people regard the campaign as very serious business, and we want to be careful that your opponents do not get the chance to misrepresent you as not taking it with sufficient seriousness.

Moderation Overboard

FOUR YEARS ago, Sen. Spessard L. Holland of Florida counseled the South to begin working on ways to comply with the Supreme Court's desegregation order. But in the Democratic primary which ended on the 9th of this month, he opposed compliance, pledged himself to work further to curb the Supreme Court's power and championed the filibuster as the proper Southern weapon against civil rights legislation. He attacked his primary opponent, ex-Sen. Claude Pepper—a leading New Deal spokesman during his 14 year Senate service—for having supported wartime FEPC legislation and having voted to restrict the filibuster rule. And in what was partly a rerun of the campaign in which Sen. George Smathers ousted Pepper in 1950, Holland charged Pepper with being soft on Communism. He hammered day after day at the fact that Pepper had once visited Stalin, that Pepper's Senate committee had hired persons who subsequently invoked the fifth amendment when asked about Communist affiliations. He charged Pepper had authorized the introduction to two books which Holland said followed the Communist Party line. While quietly vowing he was only charging his opponent with "gullibility," Holland noisily filled the air with innuendoes which raised doubts about Pepper's loyalty.

The returns proved how well the line paid off. Holland carried all of the 67 counties save 11. The only significant Pepper county was Dade, home of cosmopolitan Miami and Miami Beach, where he won a 25,000 vote majority.

Until lately, Florida's political climate had been generally considered temperate, reflecting the views of Gov. LeRoy Collins ("Democracy is a 'sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal' unless every man stands equal before the law. . . . Justice can never walk hand-in-hand with legally-coerced racial discrimination—in any part of our land.") Collins has been the firm enemy of the Ku Klux Klan—which endorsed Holland in his campaign—and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the foe of extreme segregationists. But Florida politicians who once thought Collins could keep or lead the state to moderation are reading last Tuesday's election figures with a cold eye. Holland didn't win a 91,000-vote edge talking "moderation." He did it by talking "race and reds."

When the Marines Go

THE LAST flimsy bit of an excuse for the presence of US Marines in Lebanon will disappear when Gen. Fuad Chehab takes office as President on September 24. Expectations are that the new Lebanese cabinet, probably led by north Lebanese rebel leader Rashid Karami, will at the very least set an early date for the withdrawal of US forces. Aside from the obvious fact that the US presence in Beirut should not seem to end at the insistence of those in whose defense we intervened, our government faces the still more awkward consequence that withdrawal of the Marines from Lebanon will surely signal heavier UN pressure on the British to withdraw from Jordan.

Unlike the new government in Lebanon, which is sustained by broad, popular consent, King Hussein's regime in Amman cannot long hold up if the prop of British paratroopers is removed. Hammarskjold's effort to find a formula under which British and US troops alike could withdraw from the Middle East has been, if not a total failure, certainly inconclusive. The interposition of a UN police force is unacceptable not only to Nasser, who positively does not want one, and to Chehab, who does not need one, but also to Hussein—who knows that a UN force could not be used to protect him against his internal enemies.

Given the importance of avoiding a total collapse in Jordan (and a Nasser takeover), our best hope—in the weeks so expensively purchased with the landing of the Marines—lay in getting Nasser to accept the Hussein regime as a neutral but friendly government similar to the Chehab regime. Nasser, many still hope, might prefer not to take on the economic and political burdens of Jordan at a time when the integration of Syria into the United Arab Republic offers so many difficulties. But if Nasser's acquiescence was and is possible it has not been promoted by our apparent decision to support Charles Malik against Sudanese—and Arab League—candidate Mahgoub for the presidency of the UN Assembly. An Arab diplomat has commented that this decision alone may make Nasser unwilling to compromise—and, even if he is in a mood to compromise, make him feel he must take an extreme stand to appease the mob. In any case Nasser still possesses decisive weapons—the ability to block the Suez Canal or to engineer an Arab league oil embargo—should Britain attempt to maintain her troops in Jordan in disregard of world opinion.

Verbatimese

THE Society For the Completion Of Thoughts and Sentences has for the past several years been engaged in a continuing study of the verbatim transcripts of Presidential press conferences and Congressional committee hearings. Following the recent appearance before a Senate subcommittee of Casey Stengel, officials of the Society held an emergency session, afterwards releasing this excerpt from the transcript that they felt would have resulted had the Yankee manager paid a visit to the White House while in Washington:

STENGEL: I certainly take my cap off on all these here points you been saying—about the physical fitness and the country and the way the people—since our little get-together here, Mr. President, which it has. I mean, touching all the bases, like this feller of mine. . . .

THE PRESIDENT: Now, I would rather not get into—as you know, I do not indulge in personalities. But on broad principles—and what is this country, after all—I am pretty sure you and I are in general agreement with the portion of the electorate constituting what we might call the majority, except for a smaller minority, respecting their rights, and that is why I am here. But I will say this, and it is physical fitness. Now, you cannot use force, that sort of thing. But people must in their own hearts, which are America's greatest heritage, and we must guard against depleting these resources.

STENGEL: Like you say, it is the depletion. And still you get these fellers, they would take away the depletion and leave us to pay the full tax on the oil out where I come from, and it is the same thing in baseball. Supposing you were to take away home plate, what kind of ball game would you have left? I have never seen a ball game without a home plate, unless it was a football game, and some of my boys would like to, but I say absolutely not, as it is a very hard game on the throwing arm. Lay off these sports in the winter, is what I say, especially you have 50, 60,000 invested in a property and it's goodbye, Charlie some lummox hits him with a hockey stick or a croquet mallet. So I agree with you there, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Now, let me answer that question in this way. Did you actually hear it of your own accord, or was it something somebody made up? Because we certainly don't, that is to say, we do have a program, and if someone will bring it to me, I will be the first one to sign it. It is like life, or on the gridiron, or the battlefield. And that is why I know we are going to lick this thing, by persuasion and common sense.

STENGEL: I think you have spoken my mind pretty well, sir, especially about the bonus rule. J. M. FLAGLER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Maine Casts Its Shadow

by LOUIS H. BEAN

IF YOU WANT an easy way to predict the national Congressional election results in November, don't be thrown off by such comment as this: "The hoary notion that the nation in November goes the way Maine goes in September is not a tenable theory." (*Washington Post,* Sept. 10). This theory I find has worked well especially in mid-term election years and is likely to put in a good last performance this year.

In recent years, when Republican strength in Maine Congressional elections in September fell below 60 percent, Democrats gained control of the Congress in November. In the Congressional voting in Maine on Sept. 8, the Republican candidates received only 46.7 percent of the vote, compared with 55 percent of the vote in 1954.

There is good reason for expecting that this decline in Republican strength in Maine is the result of factors that are also bothering voters all over the land. Except for the Muskie coat-tail influence on the Maine Congressional races, the issues in Maine are essentially nation-wide issues—unemployment, rising living costs, the Goldfine-Adams case, international tensions, and an ever-widening gap between Republican promises and performance in leadership, as well as in economic and social matters.

The novelty of Maine electing a Democratic Senator, a Democratic Governor and two of its three Democratic Congressional candidates has already been widely commented on. This unique situation is perhaps sufficient warning of the way national elections will go, but for purposes of more exact predictions you need at least the following facts for each of the mid-term election years for the past 30 years:

	Republican Percent in Maine Congressional Elections		Republicans Elected to the House of Representatives	
	Percent	*4-year change*	*Candidates Elected*	*4-year change*
1926	61.7		237	
1930	61.4	— .3	220	— 17
1934	49.0	—12.4	103	—117
1938	58.5	+ 8.5	169	+ 66
1942	62.0	+ 3.5	209	+ 40
1946	63.4	+ 1.4	246	+ 37
1950	57.6	— 5.8	199	— 47
1954	54.9	— 2.7	203	+ 4
1958	46.7	— 8.2		

If you now arrange these 4-year election changes you will get the probable full significance of this year's drop in the Republican barometer in Maine.

	Change in Sept. Republican Percentage in Maine	Change in Number of Republicans Elected in Nov.
1934-1938	+ 9.5	+ 66
1938-1942	+ 3.5	+ 40
1942-1946	+ 1.4	+ 37
1926-1930	— .3	— 17
1950-1954	— 2.7	+ 4
1946-1950	— 5.8	— 57
1954-1958	— 8.2	
1930-1934	—12.4	—117

As political statistics go, this is an unusually consistent record. The rise and fall of Republican strength in Maine is followed by similar Republican gains and losses in the November election. The one discrepancy, the 1950-1954 drop in Republican strength in Maine of 2.7 points followed by a 4-seat Republican gain in the national election, is probably due to the fact that Muskie's popularity as a gubernatorial candidate, insofar as it reduced the Republican Maine Congressional vote, had only local significance. This year Muskie received 61 percent of the vote compared with 55 percent in 1954. This suggests that part of the 8.2-point drop in the Maine Republican Congressional vote needs to be discounted for use as a national barometer, perhaps down to the 1946-1950 drop of 5.8 points. You would then conclude that the Republicans might lose close to 60 seats in November.

In an article in *The New Republic* early this year I indicated that a Republican loss of 25-30 seats was a reasonable expectation because this is a mid-term year, that a loss of as many as 45 seats was not impossible in view of this being in addition a year of greater unemployment, and that a loss of as many as 60 seats was not improbable in view of the decline in the President's popularity and in the Republican tide then in progress. The Maine elections now point toward the loss of 60 seats (plus or minus the usual margin of error in this forecasting art).

LOUIS H. BEAN, *economic and political analyst, specializes in the art of predicting in business, agriculture, crops and weather as well as politics.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This Congress and the Next

ONE OF OUR favorite Congressmen has had a standard reply to those who speak disparagingly of Congressional performance in recent years: "This is the best you can expect until there is a clear majority of Democrats over Republicans, *not counting the Southerners*. Give us that majority and we'll show you what a Good Congress can do."

Many political prophets (including Louis Bean) believe that the Good Majority will be born this coming November. If they read Maine and other political weather signs right, 40 or more House and six or more Senate seats may shift, to give the Democrats their largest gains since 1948. And even in that year, when Harry Truman overturned the "Do-Nothing 80th Congress" in his victory over Thomas E. Dewey, fewer non-Southern Democrats than Republicans were elected to the House (167-171) and only one more Democrat than the Republican (43-42) came to the Senate. That majority lacked the margin to modify the Taft-Hartley Act, pass a strong public housing bill or extend social security. And Southerners and right-wing Republicans in coalition still outvoted the liberals of the two parties as they have done in every Congress since 1942.

Examination of the voting charts and explanations which appear on the following pages tell the story. Important programs opposed by the Southern Republican coalition this year failed in both houses by close margins. A shift of 3 votes in the Senate would have prevented reduction of the federal scholarship program. One more vote in the Senate would have increased public assistance payments to the aged and blind and lowered interest rates on loans to communities for public works. Eight more votes in the House would have provided a $2 billion loan fund to communities for the same purpose. Four votes in the House would have meant passage of a housing bill. Thirty more could have put through a food-stamp plan to distribute $1 billion in surplus commodities to needy families. Thirty more votes in the House and six in the Senate would have given us a reasonably adequate unemployment compensation system instead of the token insurance plan that was passed.

If the seers who see a 10 percent or larger shift to the Democrats in Northern and Western areas are right, next year can be different. For the first time since 1940 the liberal coalition is likely to outnumber the old conservative combination. It is not too soon, therefore, to consider what such a Congress could and should do.

Let's begin with what it could not do. No matter how hard it tries, a Democratic Congress working with a Republican President, will continue to be substantially powerless in the shaping of our foreign and defense policies. It can, through legislative pressure, sometimes force the Executive to do more or less in given directions. But Congress cannot achieve a more imaginative foreign policy, nor can it determine the strength of our defense-in-being, regardless of what resolutions or appropriations it may pass. But on some of the most crucial national concerns it can turn the country in other directions.

Only time, luck and some fast footwork prevented major damage being done to our constitutional system in the last Congress. The enemies the Supreme Court made by its series of civil liberties decisions in the last two years were—and are— fanatically determined to weaken the powers of the courts. Only fatigue in the closing hours of the session and threat of filibuster halted the drive to pass punitive laws, and even so the attempt failed by only a single vote in the Senate. A large bloc of new men, not bound to the South by a long history of coalition vote-swapping, could stop this drive dead when it starts again next year.

A Good Majority could also do much to improve the economic health of the country. The economic skies last January when Congress convened were overcast. Industrial production, business expenditures on new investment, corporate profits, and Gross National Product were all declining; unemployment was high and rising; and, in the midst of it all, the cost of living registered month to month increases with mysterious but inexorable regularity. Particularly hard hit was the automobile industry which has come to affect quite directly the fortunes of one out of six American industrial workers, and, indirectly, the rest of the community. The pace of these changes was rapid: industrial production fell 13 percent between August, 1957 (a bearable figure), reached 5.2 million in March. Even by January the portents were plain that this recession was more serious than the mild dip of 1953-54.

The 85th Congress could have dealt with the problem in one of four ways. It could have done little or nothing, a course of inaction which, it became increasingly clear, was the President's. In an effort to increase consumer and business spending, it could have cut taxes. Here it might have behaved conservatively by retaining the current income distribution and reducing taxes on all income groups, or, as liberals preferred, it might have diminished the degree of income inequality by cutting taxes more sharply on low incomes. Or, a third possibility which recommended itself to many was to increase expenditures for public works, for here was an excellent opportunity to remedy some of our chronic deficiencies in school construction, public housing and other community

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amenities. Here again there was a conservative variant: Congress could have accelerated road and post office construction, public works which seem to exasperate the foes of federal spending least. Finally, Congress might have combined tax cuts and public works. But, speed was essential. Whatever Congress did would lose much of its effect by delay. And, there was an immediate problem, the plight of those unemployed whose 26-week compensation was running out.

How did the Congress respond: General tax reduction was defeated in the Senate and never reached a House vote. The only tax legislation passed granted insultingly trivial relief to small enterprises. Nearly half a year after it assembled, a weak and conservative extension of unemployment compensation was passed. Measures to authorize public expenditures fared scarcely better. The House killed the community facilities bill which would have allowed cities to borrow funds for public works. A housing bill which included increased support for urban renewal and public housing passed the Senate, but perished in the House. Congress' only action on housing was liberalization of FHA credit. In fact, the only constructive measure to survive was the Douglas-Payne program of area development, addressed not to the immediate threat of recession, but to the longer-run difficulties of the depressed coal and textile centers of the East, and the poverty-stricken rural regions of the South. And this the President vetoed.

How could the more liberal Congress which may assemble next January set about making up for lost opportunities? To begin with, its most immediate concern should be a sharp pick-up in US economic growth. The most optimistic forecasters speak of an early return to pre-recession levels of output and employment. It is apparently necessary to point out again, that these are not good enough. Year-to-year additions to the labor force demand an *expansion* of employment and output beyond what was normal. Improvements in techniques should make the increase in output more rapid than the increase in employment. And recovery so far has had only moderate impact on unemployment.

The liberal objective is to get Congress back to work on the agenda it had before the conservative coalition attained its veto in 1942. It is to employ government fully to achieve what Kenneth Galbraith calls social balance. For example, this country, so rich in consumer durables, has been tolerating unnecessarily a shameful poverty in everything which makes urban life pleasant, from clean streets to well-kept parks, from modern schools to decent dwellings. A Congress, blessed with taste and courage could do nothing more important than diminish the feeling that public services are an annoying expense, rather than a creative contribution.

An imaginative program to restore the balance between the public and the private sectors does not conflict with the need to stimulate the resumption of economic growth. Indeed, the two go hand in hand. What are some of the elements of such a program? One is an amplified community facilities act. Another is a large program of urban renewal and public housing, designed to correct urban blight and eliminate the slums which still disgrace every large city. Very high among the priorities should be school construction, which inexplicably vanished from the ken both of President and Congress in the last session. Finally, something should be done to cushion the shock of transition from farm to city of so many families.

None of these measures is novel. It isn't new ideas that are needed. It is a Congress that will give life to some old ideas whose value has been evident for at least several decades. What is needed is a firm belief that the community, acting through its elected representatives can make the national life finer. In the absence of such a conviction, it is dubious whether even a more strongly Democratic Congress will improve noticeably on the record of its predecessor.

All of these measures have one common characteristic: they cost money. That money, in prosperity, should and can be raised by taxation. Since recovery is incomplete, these new measures will inevitably add to the budgetary deficit. Such deficits are inflationary. Can we afford to add to the inflationary pressures which are already strong enough to resist sharp economic contraction? Liberals cannot honestly evade this question; but neither should it cause panic. Inflation is no pleasant phenomenon, but a community can stand our present 3 percent or so annual increase in prices by giving special aid where necessary, (as for example, to pensioners) in the shape of higher social security allowances. The human costs of high unemployment are greater than those of moderate inflation.

Moreover, we need not assume that nothing can be done to contain inflation. One of the causes of price increase has been the tacit collusion among large corporations to raise prices as wages have increased, frequently by larger amounts. A vigorous program of antitrust enforcement would have a sensible effect upon this pattern. One of its corollaries would be a stiffer bargaining attitude on the part of companies, not sure any longer that they can readily pass on wage increases. Unions are frequently blamed for pressing for wage gains greater than productivity improvements. Part of the blame properly falls on the oligopolistic organization of most American manufacturing which diminishes company resistance to wage demands and makes increases an actual source of profit. In addressing themselves to this seemingly intractable problem, we should not exclude the possibility of selective price controls on such key items as steel and other metals. Undoubtedly, price controls should be a late, not a first, resort. But used wisely, they might control inflation and interfere only moderately with free industrial decision.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Key Votes of Each Member of Congress

THERE ARE FEW issues in public life on which some valid argument cannot be made for both sides. And yet for the legislator, a time comes when one side or the other must be chosen and a vote cast; *yea* or *nay*. Granting that in more than one instance there is no overwhelming preponderance of right or wrong, the editors of this journal of opinion have selected 10 outstanding issues of this year on which the Members of the 85th Congress were called upon to take sides. The voting records of every Congressman and our reasons for assigning a *plus* or *minus* follow.

SENATE

1. *Foreign Aid: June 5, 1958*

To free the President from Battle Act restrictions on the extension of economic aid to Communist-bloc countries—notably Gomulka's Poland—the Foreign Relations Committee authorized aid to Communist-dominated nations other than the Soviet Union, Communist China and North Korea. The Administration encouraged the committee to do so, and Republican members therefore voted for the provision inserted in the Mutual Security Act. Before that bill came to a vote, however, Sen. William Knowland returned from a campaign trip to California and announced to the White House that he would move to strike the satellite-aid amendment from the bill. The Administration promptly withdrew its support from the provision and Knowland's amendment passed, 43-42.

►*Twenty-seven Democrats and 15 Republicans opposed the amendment; 17 Democrats and 26 Republicans supported it. (A vote against it is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)*

2. *Reciprocal Trade: July 22, 1958*

The battle to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 for the 11th time was fought along the same lines as every extension fight since 1948, when Congress first began to restrict the President's authority to make tariff concessions to promote the growth of foreign trade. Protectionists argued for stronger barriers against "cheap foreign goods." Freer trade advocates insisted that our $20 billion yearly exports are more important to the economy than losses from competitive imports.

An amendment sponsored by Sen. Robert Kerr (D, Okla.) took the extreme protectionist position, providing that in the future the President could overrule rate increases made by the Tariff Commission only when two-thirds of the members of both chambers of Congress voted to uphold him. Majority Leader Johnson moved to eliminate the Kerr amendment. Agreed to, 63-27.

►*Twenty-seven Democrats and 36 Republicans supported Johnson's motion; 18 Democrats and 9 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for the motion is marked plus; against, minus.)*

3. *Social Security: August 16, 1958*

President Eisenhower's only request for action in the field of social security this year was for a reduction of the federal government's share in public assistance payments. Democrats began a drive to raise social security benefits to keep pace with inflation, which resulted in a Senate Finance Committee recommendation of a 7 percent increase. Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D, Tex.) moved that benefits be raised by 10 percent instead. Rejected 32-53.

►*Twenty-six Democrats and 6 Republicans supported the amendment; 20 Democrats and 33 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for the amendment is marked plus; against, minus.)*

4. *Unemployment Pay: May 28, 1958*

As unemployment increased in 1958, so did the number of workers who had exhausted their rights to unemployment compensation. There were an estimated 800,000 such "exhaustees" by the end of March and every week at least 30,000 more were added.

Sen. John Kennedy (D, Mass.) proposed a broad revision of the unemployment compensation system, providing federal funds for extending coverage to more workers for a longer period of time. The President, however, recommended a much more modest temporary program. Senator Kennedy offered an amendment to the Administration bill to extend the duration of benefit payments to 16 weeks and to provide federal administration if the states did not act. Defeated 36-47.

►*Twenty-four Democrats and 12 Republicans supported the*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amendment; 14 Democrats and 33 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for it is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)

5. *Tax Cuts: June 18, 1958*

Although an overwhelming number of economists agreed that a sizable tax cut would be the quickest and surest anti-recession remedy (they divided on where the cuts should come), the Eisenhower Administration insisted that we could not afford the federal deficit a cut would mean. Democratic Leaders Rayburn and Johnson sided with their fellow Texan, Treasury Secretary Anderson, to help put through a no-change tax extension bill. But in the Senate Paul Douglas (D, Ill.) forced the issue to a vote by moving to attach to the no-change bill a $6 billion package of income and excise tax cuts. Defeated 23-65.

► *Twenty Democrats and 3 Republicans supported the amendment; 24 Democrats and 41 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for cuts is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)*

6. *Depletion Allowances: August 11, 1958*

Two months later, the Senate was not so concerned with the federal deficit. Sen. William Proxmire (D, Wis.) proposed limiting the 27.5 percent depletion allowance, which gives huge tax savings, to oil and gas producers with incomes of $1 million or less. The President took no position on the matter. The motion was defeated 31-58. But the vote was the largest ever recorded in opposition to special treatment for the oil and gas interests.

► *Twenty-one Democrats and 10 Republicans supported the amendment; 22 Democrats and 36 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for limit is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)*

7. *Billboard Regulation: March 26, 1958*

Against violent opposition of the billboard companies the Senate broadened the bill for a $40 billion Interstate Highway System to include a 1.5 percent bonus payment to states agreeing to regulate billboard advertising within 660 feet of highway rights-of-way. Sen. Robert Kerr (D, Okla.) tried to strike out this inducement to keep billboards off the highways, but the provision stayed in. Motion defeated 41-47.

► *Twenty-one Democrats and 20 Republicans supported the amendment; 24 Democrats and 23 Republicans opposed it. (A vote against it is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)*

8. *Labor-Management Reform: June 14, 1958*

To eliminate objectionable practices uncovered by the McClellan rackets investigation, Sens. John Kennedy (D, Mass.) and Irving Ives (R, N.Y.) introduced a bipartisan measure (S3974) which had final support of both organized labor and Senator McClellan. But it was only after five days of debate and 22 rollcall votes on amendments that the Senate passed the bill (88-1) and sent it to the House (which refused to act). Right-wing Republicans and Democrats introduced a stream of amendments whose purpose was more anti-union than anti-corruption. One of the most damaging potentially, offered by Sen. William Knowland (R, Calif.), would have required unions to hold secret ballot referenda on recalling officers or changing constitutions whenever 20 percent of the members so petitioned. If adopted it would have seriously weakened union leadership by exposing it to the constant harrassment of small minorities. Rejected 31-52.

► *Six Democrats and 25 Republicans supported the amendment; 40 Democrats and 12 Republicans opposed it. (A vote against the move is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)*

9. *Anti-Supreme Court: August 21, 1958*

The mounting hostility of conservative Democrats and Republicans toward the Supreme Court as a result of its civil liberties decisions of the last two years culminated in the Jenner-Butler bill to strip the court of many of its powers. After agreeing by a close vote to table this omnibus measure in the final hours of the session, the Senate was dangerously close to passing a sweeping House bill (HR3) repealing the doctrine of federal pre-emption of state authority.

A motion by Sen. John Carroll (D, Colo.) to recommit the measure to the Judiciary Committee temporarily halted by only one vote the drive to curb the court. Court critics, under threat of a liberal filibuster, agreed 41-40 to drop the matter—until next year.

► *Twenty-seven Democrats and 14 Republicans supported the motion; 17 Democrats and 23 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for the motion is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)*

10. *Aid to Education: August 13, 1958*

Educators hail the National Defense Education Act as the most comprehensive federal law in support of education passed since the second land-grant college bill was enacted 68 years ago. There was disappointment that the program of federal scholarships was dropped from the bill at the last minute. And, of course, the new bill does nothing to aid school construction. But it does authorize nearly $900 million in the next four years to improve the quality of elementary and secondary teaching in science, mathematics and languages; for counseling and guidance training and for graduate fellowships. Passage of the bill (62-26) marked a great step forward in federal financing of education.

► *Thirty-five Democrats and 27 Republicans supported the bill; 10 Democrats and 16 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for the bill is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)*

HOUSE

1. *Foreign Aid: May 14, 1958*

By a smaller margin than last year, the House authorized a slightly lower expenditure for foreign aid. But more than one-third of the members refused to support the program even after the House Foreign Affairs Committee had cut $339 million from the sum requested by the President. Passed 259-134.

► *One hundred and fifty Democrats and 109 Republicans supported the authorization; 58 Democrats and 76 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for the bill is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)*

2. *Reciprocal Trade: June 11, 1958*

As an amendment to the bill to extend the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for five more years (see Senate vote No. 2), Rep. Daniel Reed (R, N.Y.), one of the most determined protectionists in the House, moved to kill the measure outright by recommitting it to Committee without instructions, but it was saved for compromise when Reed's motion was rejected 146-268.

► *Sixty-one Democrats and 85 Republicans supported re-*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commital; 160 Democrats and 108 Republicans opposed it. (A vote against the motion is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)

3. *Unemployment Pay: May 1, 1958*

The House Ways and Means Committee proposed a revision of the unemployment compensation system in between the plans offered by Senator Kennedy and President Eisenhower (See Senate vote No. 4). But a coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans, led by Rep. A. S. Herlong (D, Fla.), was strong enough to substitute a watered-down bill backed by the Administration allowing the states to join the program or stay out. Passed 223-165.

► *Sixty Democrats and 163 Republicans supported the substitute bill; 148 Democrats and 17 Republicans opposed it. (A vote against it is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)*

4. *Public Works: August 1, 1958*

A community facilities bill to provide funds for loans to cities for public works was a "must" anti-recession measure in the Democratic program. Majority Leader Johnson maneuvered it through the Senate. But, when after months of delay, a vote finally came on increasing the fund for loans to municipalities from $100 million to $2 billion, the House killed it by refusing to adopt a rule for its consideration. Defeated 173-187.

► *One hundred and fifty-one Democrats and 22 Republicans supported consideration; 36 Democrats and 151 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for the motion is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)*

5. *Housing: August 18, 1958*

The annual omnibus housing bill, covering urban renewal, public housing and college housing, died in the House after clearing the Senate with little debate. Because the House Rules Committee under Rep. Howard Smith (D, Va.) refused to grant the bill a rule, in order to block the program, housing supporters had no alternative but to attempt to suspend the rules and bring the bill to a vote. That requires the consent of two-thirds of the members and the House divided 251-134—six votes short of the necessary majority.

► *One hundred and eighty-five Democrats and 66 Republicans supported the motion; 23 Democrats and 111 Republicans opposed it. (A vote for the motion is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)*

6. *Labor-Management Reform: Aug. 18, 1958*

When the Kennedy-Ives anti-corruption bill (see Senate vote No. 8) reached the House, the Labor Committee was bogged down in consideration of the pension fund bill and other legislation. Acting on the general belief that Chairman Graham Barden (D, N.C.), given the chance, would only smother the bill in any case, Speaker Rayburn followed the unusual procedure of holding the bill at his desk. Finally on August 18, in a desperate effort to get some kind of labor reform law on the books, a move was made to bring the bill to the floor under a suspension of the rules. The motion by Rep. John McCormack (D, Mass.) for suspension was defeated 190-198.

► *One hundred and forty-nine Democrats and 41 Republicans voted to suspend the rules; 61 Democrats and 137 Republicans voted against suspension. (A vote for suspension of the rules is marked plus; a vote against, minus.)*

7. *Anti-Supreme Court: July 17, 1958*

The drive to put the Supreme Court in its place (see Senate vote No. 9) took the form of the Smith bill (HR 3) in the House. Effectively repealing the doctrine of federal pre-emption, Rep. Smith (D, Va.) urged that no act of Congress should be construed as nullifying state laws on the same subject unless Congress so specified (thus overruling the Court in the Nelson case). Passed 241-155.

► *One hundred Democrats and 141 Republicans supported the bill; 109 Democrats and 46 Republicans opposed it. (A vote against the bill is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)*

8. *Amend Mallory Rule: July 2, 1958*

In another move to slap down the Supreme Court, the House voted to amend the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to bar federal judges from disqualifying confessions of suspects solely because of delays in bringing the suspect for arraignment. The Supreme Court on June 24, 1957, had invalidated the rape conviction of Andrew Mallory in the Washington, D. C., Federal District Court on the ground that his confession was obtained after unnecessary delay between his arrest and arraignment. The House in effect voted to reverse the Supreme Court ruling, 294-79.

► *Seventy-five Democrats and 4 Republicans voted against the bill; 125 Democrats and 169 Republicans voted for it. (A vote against the bill is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)*

9. *Aid to Education: August 8, 1958*

House leaders had paved the way for the National Defense Education Bill (see Senate vote No. 10) before the vote came. In negotiations between Sen. Lister Hill and Rep. Carl Elliott (Ala.) for the Democrats and Sen. Alexander Smith (N.J.) and Rep. Carroll Kearns (Pa.) for the Republicans, a compromise bill was written. And Rep. Adam Clayton Powell had somehow been persuaded not to offer his anti-discrimination amendment which had killed school construction bills in 1956 and 1957. Opponents of any kind of federal support for education made their last stand behind Rep. Ralph Gwinn (R, N.Y.) on his motion to recommit the bill to committee and so to kill it. Defeated 140-233.

► *One hundred and forty-seven Democrats and 86 Republicans opposed the motion; 45 Democrats and 95 Republicans supported it. (A vote against the motion is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)*

10. *Government Security: July 10, 1958*

The purpose of this bill was to overrule the meaning of the Supreme Court's 1956 decision on the government security program. In the case of *Cole v. Young*, the Court held that the law empowering the head of a government agency to suspend employees in "the interest of national security" did not apply to "non-sensitive positions." This bill gave the President specific statutory power to extend the program to all federal employees, in spite of warnings from Reps. Chet Holifield (D, Cal.) and Charles Porter (D, Ore.), that the bill would "actually weaken" the national security by requiring superficial investigation of millions of persons in non-security positions. Passed 295-46.

► *Forty-six Democrats and 0 Republicans voted against the bill; 131 Democrats and 164 Republicans voted for it. (A vote against the bill is marked plus; a vote for, minus.)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RECORD OF THE SENATE

	1 Foreign Aid	2 Reciprocal Trade	3 Social Security	4 Unemployment Pay	5 Tax Cuts	6 Depletion Allowances	7 Billboard Regulation	8 Labor-Management Reform	9 Anti-Supreme Court	10 Aid to Education
ALABAMA										
Hill (D)	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	+	−	+
Sparkman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	+	−	+
ARIZONA										
Hayden (D)	+	−	−	+	O	−	+	+	+	+
Goldwater (R)	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−
ARKANSAS										
Fulbright (D)	+	+	−	O	+	−	+	+	−	+
McClellan (D)	−	−	−	O	−	−	−	+	−	+
CALIFORNIA										
Knowland (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	+
Kuchel (R)	−	+	−	+	−	−	+	+	−	+
COLORADO										
Carroll (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Allott (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	+
CONNECTICUT										
Bush (R)	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	+	+
Purtell (R)	+	+	−	−	−	+	+	−	+	+
DELAWARE										
Frear (D)	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Williams (R)	−	+	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−
FLORIDA										
Holland (D)	−	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	+
Smathers (D)	+	−	−	+	+	−	+	+	−	+
GEORGIA										
Russell (D)	−	−	−	−	−	O	−	−	−	−
Talmadge (D)	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−
IDAHO										
Church (D)	+	+	+	O	−	+	+	+	+	+
Dworshak (R)	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
ILLINOIS										
Douglas (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dirksen (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	+
INDIANA										
Capehart (R)	O	+	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−
Jenner (R)	−	−	O	O	O	−	−	−	−	−
IOWA										
Hickenlooper (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Martin (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+
KANSAS										
Carlson (R)	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	O	+
Schoeppel (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
KENTUCKY										
Cooper (R)	+	+	−	+	−	−	+	+	+	+
Morton (R)	+	+	−	+	−	−	+	O	+	+
LOUISIANA										
Ellender (D)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	+
Long (D)	O	−	+	+	+	−	+	+	−	+
MAINE										
Payne (R)	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
Smith (R)	−	−	+	−	−	+	+	+	−	+
MARYLAND										
Beall (R)	−	+	−	+	−	−	+	+	+	+
Butler (R)	−	+	O	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
MASSACHUSETTS										
Kennedy (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Saltonstall (R)	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	O	+	+
MICHIGAN										
McNamara (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+
Potter (D)	−	+	+	−	−	+	−	−	−	+
MINNESOTA										
Humphrey (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Thye (R)	+	+	−	−	+	+	+	+	−	+
MISSISSIPPI										
Eastland (D)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−
Stennis (D)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−
MISSOURI										
Hennings (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Symington (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MONTANA										
Mansfield (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+
Murray (D)	O	−	+	+	+	O	−	+	+	+
NEBRASKA										
Curtis (R)	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Hruska (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
NEVADA										
Bible (D)	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	+	−
Malone (R)	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	+	+	−
NEW HAMPSHIRE										
Bridges (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−
Cotton (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	+
NEW JERSEY										
Case (R)	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
Smith (R)	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	O	+	+
NEW MEXICO										
Anderson (D)	−	−	−	O	O	−	+	+	+	+
Chavez (D)	−	−	+	+	−	O	−	O	+	+
NEW YORK										
Ives (R)	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	+	O	+
Javits (R)	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
NORTH CAROLINA										
Ervin (D)	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	+	−	+
Jordan (D)	−	−	−	−	−	+		+	−	+
NORTH DAKOTA										
Langer (R)	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+
Young (R)	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	O	+
OHIO										
Lausche (D)	−	+	−	−	−	+	+	−	+	−
Bricker (R)	−	O	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−
OKLAHOMA										
Kerr (D)	+	−	−	+	−	−	−	+	−	+
Monroney (D)	+	+	−	+	−	−	+	+	+	+
OREGON										
Morse (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Neuberger (D)	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
PENNSYLVANIA										
Clark (D)	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
Martin (R)	O	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
RHODE ISLAND										
Green (D)	+	+	−	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
Pastore (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
SOUTH CAROLINA										
Johnston (D)	−	−	+	+	+	−	−	+	−	+
Thurmond (D)	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
SOUTH DAKOTA										
Case (R)	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	+	+
Mundt (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+
TENNESSEE										
Gore (D)	+	+	+	O	−	+	+	O	−	+
Kefauver (D)	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
TEXAS										
Yarborough (D)	+	O	+	+	+	−	−	+	+	+
Johnson (D)	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	+	+	+
UTAH										
Bennett (R)	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	−
Watkins (R)	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−
VERMONT										
Aiken (R)	+	+	−	+	−	+	+	+	+	+
Flanders (R)	−	+	O	−	−	−	O	−	O	O
VIRGINIA										
Byrd (D)	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−
Robertson (D)	−	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	−
WASHINGTON										
Jackson (D)	+	+	+	+	O	+	+	+	+	+
Magnuson (D)	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
WEST VIRGINIA										
Hoblitzell (R)	−	−	−	+	−	−	+	−	−	+
Revercomb (R)	−	−	+	+	−	−	+	O	−	+
WISCONSIN										
Proxmire (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Wiley (R)	+	+	+	−	−	+	+	−	+	+
WYOMING										
O'Mahoney (D)	O	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Barrett (R)	−	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	+

New Republic ratings:

The symbol [+] indicates NR's agreement with the position taken; the symbol [−] indicates disagreement. The pairs for and against legislation follow the same general classification. Those paired generally, absent, not voting or not announced are tabulated [O]. A blank indicates that the incumbent was not at that time a member of the Senate.

Votes compiled from reports of the Congressional Quarterly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RECORD OF THE HOUSE

	Foreign Aid	Reciprocal Trade	Unemployment Pay	Public Works	Housing Loans	Labor-Management Reform	Anti-Supreme Court	Amend Mallory Rule	Aid to Education	Government Security
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ALABAMA										
3 Andrews (D)	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	+	–
1 Boykin (D)	+	+	–	–	+	O	–	–	+	O
7 Elliott (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
2 Grant (D)	–	–	O	+	+	–	–	–	+	–
9 Huddleston (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
8 Jones (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	O
5 Rains (D)	+	+	O	+	+	+	–	O	+	O
4 Roberts (D)	+	–	O	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
6 Selden (D)	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
ARIZONA										
2 Udall (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1 Rhodes (R)	–	+	O	–	–	–	–	O	–	–
ARKANSAS										
1 Gathings (D)	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
4 Harris (D)	+	+	O	+	+	–	–	–	+	–
5 Hays (D)	+	+	–	O	+	–	–	O	+	O
2 Mills (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
6 Norrell (D)	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	O
3 Trimble (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	O	+	O
CALIFORNIA										
2 Engle (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
14 Hagen (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
11 McFall (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
8 Miller (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3 Moss (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
29 Saund (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	O	+	–
5 Shelley (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
27 Sheppard (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
12 Sisk (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
7 Allen (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
6 Baldwin (R)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
10 Gubser (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
4 Mailliard (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
1 Scudder (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
13 Teague (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
28 Utt (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
30 Wilson (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	O	+	–
9 Younger (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
Los Angeles County										
23 Doyle (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
19 Holifield (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
17 King (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
26 Roosevelt (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
21 Hiestand (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
25 Hillings (R)	+	+	–	–	+	O	–	–	+	–
22 Holt (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
18 Hosmer (R)	+	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	–
16 Jackson (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
24 Lipscomb (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
15 McDonough (R)	–	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	–
20 Smith (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
COLORADO										
4 Aspinall (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
1 Rogers (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
3 Chenoweth (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
2 Hill (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
CONNECTICUT										
3 Cretella (R)	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
1 May (R)	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	–	+	–
4 Morano (R)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
5 Patterson (R)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
AL Sadlak (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–
2 Seely-Brown (R)	+	–	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
DELAWARE										
AL Haskell (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	O	+	–
FLORIDA										
2 Bennett (D)	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	–
4 Fascell (D)	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	–
7 Haley (D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5 Herlong (D)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
8 Matthews (D)	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–
6 Rogers (D)	–	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	–
3 Sikes (D)	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	+	O
1 Cramer (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

New Republic ratings:

The symbol [+] indicates NR's agreement with the position taken; the symbol [–] indicates disagreement. The pairs for and against legislation follow the same general classification. Those paired generally, absent, not voting or not announced are tabulated [O]. A blank indicates that the incumbent was not at that time a member of the House.

* The Speaker of the House does not vote except in case of a tie.

Votes compiled from reports of the Congressional Quarterly.

	Foreign Aid	Reciprocal Trade	Unemployment Pay	Public Works	Housing Loans	Labor-Management Reform	Anti-Supreme Court	Amend Mallory Rule	Aid to Education	Government Security
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GEORGIA										
8 Blitch (D)	–	–	–	O	O	O	–	–	–	–
10 Brown (D)	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
5 Davis (D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4 Flynt (D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3 Forrester (D)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
9 Landrum (D)	–	–	–	O	O	–	–	–	–	O
7 Mitchell (D)	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	+	–
2 Pilcher (D)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
1 Preston (D)	–	–	–	O	O	O	–	–	O	–
6 Vinson (D)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
IDAHO										
1 Pfost (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
2 Budge (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
ILLINOIS										
25 Gray (D)	–	–	+	+	+	O	+	O	+	–
21 Mack (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
24 Price (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
16 Allen (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
17 Arends (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
19 Chiperfield (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
14 Vacancy										
15 Mason (R)	–	–	–	–	–	O	–	O	–	O
18 Michel (R)	–	+	–	O	–	–	+	–	O	–
20 Simpson (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
22 Springer (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–
23 Vursell (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	O	+	–
Chicago—Cook County										
7 Libonati (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
12 Boyle (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1 Dawson (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
8 Gordon (D)	+	+	+	O	+	+	+	+	O	+
5 Kluczynski (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6 O'Brien (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2 O'Hara (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
9 Yates (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3 Byrne (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
13 Church (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10 Collier (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4 Vacancy										
11 Sheehan (R)	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	–
INDIANA										
8 Denton (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
1 Madden (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4 Adair (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5 Beamer (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7 Bray (R)	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
11 Brownson (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	O	–	–
2 Halleck (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
6 Harden (R)	–	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
10 Harvey (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3 Nimtz (R)	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
9 Wilson (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
IOWA										
6 Coad (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
5 Cunningham (R)	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
3 Gross (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
8 Hoeven (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7 Jensen (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4 LeCompte (R)	+	+	–	–	O	O	–	–	–	–
1 Schwengel (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	–	–	–
2 Talle (R)	–	+	–	O	–	–	–	O	–	O
KANSAS										
5 Breeding (D)	+	+	O	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
1 Avery (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
3 George (R)	+	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
4 Rees (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2 Scrivner (R)	–	–	O	O	–	–	–	–	–	–
6 Smith (R)	–	–	–	O	–	–	O	–	O	–
KENTUCKY										
4 Chelf (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
1 Gregory (D)	+	O	+	+	+	–	O	–	+	–
2 Natcher (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
7 Perkins (D)	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	O
5 Spence (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	O	–
6 Watts (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
3 Robsion (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
8 Siler (R)	–	–	–	+	O	O	–	–	+	–
LOUISIANA										
2 Boggs (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	O	+	–
4 Brooks (D)	–	+	+	–	O	O	–	O	O	–
1 Hebert (D)	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	–	O	–
8 Vacancy										
6 Morrison (D)	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	O	+	O
5 Passman (D)	–	+	+	O	–	+	–	–	–	O
7 Thompson (D)	O	+	+	+	+	O	–	–	O	O
3 Willis (D)	O	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	–	O

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Foreign Aid	Reciprocal Trade	Unemployment Pay	Public Works	Housing Loans	Labor-Management Reform	Anti-Supreme Court	Amend Mallory Rule	Aid to Education	Government Security
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
MAINE										
2 Coffin (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1 Hale (R)	+	–	–	–	O	O	+	–	+	–
3 McIntire (R)	–	–	–	–	O	O	–	–	+	–
MARYLAND										
4 Fallon (D)	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	–
7 Friedel (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
3 Garmatz (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
5 Lankford (D)	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
2 Devereux (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
6 Hyde (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
1 Miller (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
MASSACHUSETTS										
2 Boland (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4 Donohue (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
7 Lane (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
8 Macdonald (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
12 McCormack (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
11 O'Neill (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
3 Philbin (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
6 Bates (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10 Curtis (R)	+	+	–	–	–	+	+	–	+	–
1 Heselton (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
14 Martin (R)	+	+	–	–	O	O	–	–	+	–
9 Nicholson (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5 Rogers (R)	+	–	+	–	+	+	O	–	+	–
13 Wigglesworth (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
MICHIGAN										
12 Bennett (R)	–	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
8 Bentley (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
18 Broomfield (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	–
10 Cederberg (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
6 Chamberlain (R)	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	–	+	–
5 Ford (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
9 Griffin (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
4 Hoffman (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
3 Johansen (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
11 Knox (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
7 McIntosh (R)	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	O	+	–
2 Meader (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
Detroit—Wayne County										
13 Diggs (D)	+	+	+	O	+	+	+	+	+	+
15 Dingell (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
17 Griffiths (D)	+	O	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
16 Lesinski (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
1 Machrowicz (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
14 Rabaut (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MINNESOTA										
8 Blatnik (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
9 Knutson (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
6 Marshall (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
4 McCarthy (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
3 Wier (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
7 Anderson (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O	–	–
1 Quie (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
5 Judd (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
2 O'Hara (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
MISSISSIPPI										
1 Abernethy (D)	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
6 Colmer (D)	–	–	–	+	O	O	–	–	–	–
3 Smith (D)	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
2 Whitten (D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4 Williams (D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5 Winstead (D)	–	–	–	+	O	O	–	–	–	–
MISSOURI										
5 Bolling (D)	+	+	+	O	+	+	+	+	+	+
7 Brown (D)	–	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	+	O
9 Cannon (D)	–	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	–
8 Carnahan (D)	+	+	+	O	+	+	+	+	O	O
4 Christopher (D)	+	+	+	O	+	+	+	O	O	O
6 Hull (D)	–	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	–
10 Jones (D)	+	+	O	O	O	O	–	O	+	–
1 Karsten (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	O	+	+
11 Moulder (D)	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	O
3 Sullivan (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2 Curtis (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	–	O
MONTANA										
2 Anderson (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
1 Metcalf (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+

	Foreign Aid	Reciprocal Trade	Unemployment Pay	Public Works	Housing Loans	Labor-Management Reform	Anti-Supreme Court	Amend Mallory Rule	Aid to Education	Government Security
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEBRASKA										
2 Cunningham (R)	–	+	O	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
3 Harrison (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
4 Miller (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1 Weaver (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
NEVADA										
AL Baring (D)	–	–	+	O	+	+	–	–	O	O
NEW HAMPSHIRE										
2 Bass (R)	+	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	–
1 Merrow (R)	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
NEW JERSEY										
11 Addonizio (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
14 Dellay (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	O	–
10 Rodino (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
13 Sieminski (D)	O	+	+	O	+	+	+	+	O	O
4 Thompson (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	O
3 Auchincloss (R)	+	+	O	–	–	–	+	–	–	–
8 Canfield (R)	+	–	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
6 Dwyer (R)	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
5 Frelinghuysen (R)	+	+	–	–	–	+	+	O	+	–
2 Glenn (R)	+	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	+	–
12 Kean (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
9 Osmers (R)	+	–	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
7 Widnall (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	+	–	+	–
1 Wolverton (R)	+	–	–	O	+	+	+	–	+	O
NEW MEXICO										
AL Vacancy										
AL Montoya (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	O	+	O
NEW YORK										
30 O'Brien (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	O
3 Becker (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
37 Robison (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2 Derounian (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
26 Dooley (R)	+	+	O	–	+	–	+	–	+	O
27 Gwinn (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O	–	O
32 Kearney (R)	+	–	–	–	–	O	–	–	–	O
38 Keating (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	+	–	+	–
33 Kilburn (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	O	–	O
40 Miller (R)	+	+	–	–	–	O	–	–	–	–
39 Ostertag (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
42 Pillion (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
41 Radwan (R)	O	O	O	–	O	O	–	+	–	O
43 Reed (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
35 Riehlman (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	–
28 St. George (R)	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
36 Taber (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
31 Taylor (R)	+	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–
1 Wainwright (R)	+	+	–	–	O	+	+	+	+	–
29 Wharton (R)	–	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	+	–
34 Williams (R)	O	+	–	–	–	O	O	O	–	O
New York City										
8 Anfuso (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	O
24 Buckley (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	O
11 Celler (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
7 Delaney (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
23 Dollinger (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
19 Farbstein (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
22 Healey (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
6 Holtzman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
10 Kelly (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
9 Keogh (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
13 Multer (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
16 Powell (D)	+	+	+	O	O	+	+	+	+	O
14 Rooney (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
18 Santangelo (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
20 Teller (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
21 Zelenko (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
5 Bosch (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
17 Caudert (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	+	–	+	–
12 Dorn (R)	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
25 Fino (R)	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	O	O
4 Latham (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O	O
15 Ray (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
NORTH CAROLINA										
9 Alexander (D)	–	–	–	O	–	–	–	–	–	–
3 Barden (D)	–	–	–	O	O	–	–	–	–	–
1 Bonner (D)	–	+	–	O	+	–	–	–	–	–
4 Cooley (D)	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	–	+	–
6 Durham (D)	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
2 Fountain (D)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
8 Kitchin (D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7 Lennon (D)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
5 Scott (D)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
12 Shuford (D)	O	O	–	O	O	O	–	O	–	–
11 Whitener (D)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
10 Jonas (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Foreign Aid	Reciprocal Trade	Unemployment Pay	Public Works	Housing Loans	Labor-Management Reform	Anti-Supreme Court	Amend Mallory Rule	Aid to Education	Government Security
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NORTH DAKOTA										
AL Burdick (R)	–	+	O	–	+	+	+	+	–	+
AL Krueger (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
OHIO										
9 Ashley (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
20 Feighan (D)	+	+	+	O	+	+	–	+	–	–
18 Hays (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
19 Kirwan (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6 Polk (D)	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
21 Vanik (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
14 Ayres (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	+	–	+	–
13 Baumhart (R)	+	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
8 Betts (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
22 Bolton (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
16 Bow (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7 Brown (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–
5 Clevenger (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
11 Dennison (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–
15 Henderson (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2 Hess (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10 Jenkins (R)	–	–	–	–	–	O	–	O	–	O
4 McCulloch (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
17 McGregor (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
23 Minshall (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
3 Schenck (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1 Scherer (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
12 Vorys (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
OKLAHOMA										
3 Albert (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
2 Edmondson (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	O	O	+	–
5 Jarman (D)	+	–	O	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
6 Morris (D)	–	–	+	O	+	+	–	O	O	O
4 Steed (D)	–	–	+	+	+	+	–	O	+	–
1 Belcher (R)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
OREGON										
3 Green (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4 Porter (D)	+	O	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2 Ullman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1 Norblad (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
PENNSYLVANIA										
25 Clark (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
28 Eberharter (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	O
11 Flood (D)	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	–	–
30 Holland (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
21 Dent (D)	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
26 Morgan (D)	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
14 Rhodes (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
15 Walter (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
17 Bush (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10 Carrig (R)	+	–	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
29 Corbett (R)	+	+	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
8 Curtin (R)	+	+	–	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
9 Dague (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	+	O	+	–
12 Fenton (R)	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	+	–
27 Fulton (R)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	O
23 Gavin (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–
7 James (R)	O	+	–	–	–	O	–	–	–	O
24 Kearns (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	O	O	+	–
13 Lafore (R)	O	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
16 Mumma (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
22 Saylor (R)	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	–	O
18 Simpson (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
19 Stauffer (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
20 Van Zandt (R)	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
Philadelphia										
1 Barrett (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
3 Byrne (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
4 Nix (D)		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	–
2 Granahan (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
5 Green (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
6 Scott (R)	+	+	O	+	+	+	+	O	+	–
RHODE ISLAND										
2 Fogarty (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
1 Forand (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–
SOUTH CAROLINA										
4 Ashmore (D)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
3 Dorn (D)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
5 Hemphill (D)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
6 McMillan (D)	–	–	–	O	+	–	–	–	–	O
2 Riley (D)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
1 Rivers (D)	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	O

	Foreign Aid	Reciprocal Trade	Unemployment Pay	Public Works	Housing Loans	Labor-Management Reform	Anti-Supreme Court	Amend Mallory Rule	Aid to Education	Government Security
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
SOUTH DAKOTA										
1 McGovern (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2 Berry (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
TENNESSEE										
6 Bass (D)	–	+	+	O	+	+	–	O	+	O
8 Everett (D)	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	–
9 Davis	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	O	–
4 Evins (D)	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	+	O
3 Frazier (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
5 Loser (D)	–	O	+	O	+	–	–	–	O	–
7 Murray (D)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
2 Baker (R)	+	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	O	–
1 Reece (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
TEXAS										
3 Beckworth (D)	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
2 Brooks (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
17 Burleson (D)	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
AL Dies (D)	–	O	–	O	O	O	–	O	–	O
7 Dowdy (D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	O
21 Fisher (D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
13 Ikard (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
20 Kilday (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	O
15 Kilgore (D)	–	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
19 Mahon (D)	+	+	+	–	+	+	–	–	+	–
1 Patman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
11 Poage (D)	–	+	+	O	+	+	–	–	+	–
*4 Rayburn (D)										
18 Rogers (D)	–	–	O	+	+	–	–	+	–	–
16 Rutherford (D)	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	–	–
6 Teague (D)	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–	–
8 Thomas (D)	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
9 Thompson (D)	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
10 Thornberry (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	O
12 Wright (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
14 Young (D)	–	–	+	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
5 Alger (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
UTAH										
2 Dawson (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
1 Dixon (R)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
VERMONT										
AL Prouty (R)	+	+	+	–	O	O	–	–	+	–
VIRGINIA										
4 Abbitt (D)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3 Gary (D)	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
2 Hardy (D)	+	+	–	O	+	–	–	–	–	–
7 Harrison (D)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
9 Jennings (D)	–	+	–	+	+	+	–	–	+	–
1 Robeson (D)	–	+	–	O	–	O	–	O	–	O
8 Smith (D)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5 Tuck (D)	–	+	–	O	–	–	–	–	–	–
10 Broyhill (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
6 Poff (R)	–	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
WASHINGTON										
AL Magnuson (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
4 Holmes (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–
5 Horan (R)	+	–	–	–	+	+	–	–	+	–
3 Mack (R)	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	O
1 Pelly (R)	+	+	–	–	+	+	–	–	–	–
6 Tollefson (R)	+	–	–	O	+	+	+	–	+	–
2 Westland (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	–	–
WEST VIRGINIA										
3 Bailey (D)	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	O
6 Byrd (D)	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
5 Kee (D)	–	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
2 Staggers (D)	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
1 Moore (R)	–	–	–	+	+	–	+	–	+	–
4 Neal (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
WISCONSIN										
9 Johnson (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
5 Reuss (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4 Zablocki (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
8 Byrnes (R)	+	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
7 Laird (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
10 O'Konski (R)	–	–	+	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
1 Vacancy										
2 Tewes (R)	+	+	–	–	+	–	–	–	+	–
6 Van Pelt (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3 Withrow (R)	–	–	+	–	+	+	+	–	+	O
WYOMING										
AL Thomson (R)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS & COMMENT

Silone: The Power of Example

by Irving Howe

AN OLD ITALIAN peasant thinks back to a moment of his childhood:

> I remember Don Serafino asking me at the catechism examination to explain the sign of the cross. "It reminds us of the Passion of Our Lord," I told him, "and it's also the way unfortunates sign their names." The parish priest remarked that my answer wasn't wrong, but that I was hardly in a position to revise the answers in the catechism.

These accents of sad and weary humor are uniquely Ignazio Silone's, and so too is the effort to bind together divine and human suffering, to suggest the kinship between the agony of Christ and the obscure travail of a peasant in the Abruzzi. This is the theme of his fine new novel, *The Secret of Luca,* as it has been of all his novels since *Bread and Wine.*

The Secret of Luca, by Ignazio Silone (Harper; $3.50).

Silone's desire to locate the ethic of an unspoiled primitive Christianity in the insulted and injured of our time is an act of intellectual desperation. Abstractly, it is hard to defend. He himself must surely know this better than anyone else, for nowhere in his work is his desire presented in the language of fanaticism or even self-assurance. There shines through all of his writing a tone of modesty, the tone of a man who knows it is his fate to expend himself so thoroughly on a question that the very idea of an answer fades into inconsequence.

For Silone the socialist and Silone the novelist, the only miracle of Christianity is Christ, a man whose sufferings have burdened humanity with an *intolerable* example. In all the rest—dogma, ritual, institutions—he has no interest, except perhaps as an amused spectator. His whole effort, after *Fontamara,* has been to reduce—perhaps the verb should be, to exalt—Christ to the level of a secular participant, a fellow-sufferer and thereby a sustaining example, in the misery of our time. He sees Christ not as a divinity but as a friend. It is not that he has tried to revive the superficial notion (popular a few decades ago) of Christ as the first socialist, but rather that he has tried to bring to life an image of the lonely and forsaken Christ, so as to reclaim the moral possibility of socialism, though not of socialism alone.

This effort, about which Silone himself preserves an admirable humor and skepticism, has brought him a quality rare among modern writers: a steady faith in his own characters. Despite occasional lapses, Silone's novels do not, however, succumb to any romanticizing of the peasant figures who, together with heretical priests and dissident revolutionaries, embody his notion of the moral example. He knows these peasants too well; he knows their brutishness and ignorance, as he knows the vanity and fanaticism of the priests and revolutionists. In his characteristic wryness of tone there is at least as much desperation as affection. Yet he believes in these peasants, at least in those potentialities of their being of which they themselves are seldom aware. For Silone has learned how to wait, even for that which may never come.

ON THE SURFACE Silone's latest novel is unconcerned with those political-moral themes that have occupied its predecessors. It is a simple story, deliberately "old-fashioned" in style and leisurely in pace, for Silone is here trying to yoke together a traditional and long-abused notion — the "aristocratic" notion of honor—with the character of a man at the bottom of social life.

Luca Sabbatino has suffered a lifetime of imprisonment, though everyone in his village knows him to be innocent of the crime with which he was charged; and now that he has come back, still unwilling to explain why he refused to defend himself, the mystery of his conduct is probed by Andrea Cipriano, the son of his closest friend and now a prominent radical leader. Luca's story is unfolded in a series of conversations—some of them wonderfully humorous—in which Andrea discovers his secret: that he, a simple peasant, had accepted decades of prison in order to protect the honor of a woman whom he had come to worship with "a love that was totally absurd."

It is an improbable story, of course. The judge who sentenced Luca speaks the words of the world to Andrea:

> You'd like to attribute such chivalrous ideals to a clodhopper like him? A common peasant capable of choosing life imprisonment rather than reveal a secret? A common peasant with the code of a feudal knight? Very likely, I must say.

BUT that, Silone seems to suggest with a smile, is precisely the point: without the improbability there could be no revelation. Every act of moral selflessness is by its nature improbable; it is beyond the calculus of social prediction but therefore contains enormous social possibilities. And it has these possibilities, as the discomfort of both Luca's village and Andrea Cipriano indicate, simply because it is intolerable. Andrea gradually drops his party affairs and becomes involved, as a kind of novice, in an improvised community centering about Luca and including Don Serafino, an old and neglected priest who represents the Christian remnant of the Church, and a nameless boy who adopts Luca because he finds him "good at being friends."

I have said that on the surface *The Secret of Luca* seems different from Silone's earlier, political novels; yet anyone familiar with his work will quickly see that this novel continues in the line of its predecessors, and indeed constitutes a summary recapitulation of Silone's own development. For Andrea is in part the early Silone, the author of *Fontamara* committed to the Marxist belief in mass action, and Andrea's education in humaneness as he learns Luca's story also reflects Silone's intellectual history. At the end Luca and Andrea are pronounced by Don Serafino—with an intent that is ironically at variance from Silone's—to be "a couple of innocents" who endanger "law and order."

It is a mark of Silone's moral serious-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness and his skill as a teller of stories that his simple and familiar ideas become, in his novels, an enormously stirring force. Going his own way and quite untouched by literary fashions, Silone has worked out for himself a literary form that might be called the realistic allegory. *The Secret of Luca* is first of all a story, a series of narrated events concerning "real" people in a "real place.

There is little of the abstractness or vaporousness that one can usually find in modern attempts at allegory; the schema of intention does not consume the flow of incidents. Nor is there that multiplicity and fluidity of reference that characterizes modern symbolism. Yet, as we are absorbed by the sequence of action, we become aware that Luca's story is controlled by a kind of allegorical meaning, indicated by the very names of the characters: Luca Sabbatini, the light of Sabbath; Don Serafino, the angelic; Andrea, man.

THERE NEED BE no complaint against this method as such, but I would complain that in his recent novels Silone has reined in too tightly his incomparable gifts for anecdote, that he has overdisciplined himself in behalf of his motivating ideas. There are, to be sure, many marvelous pages in *The Secret of Luca,* and the novel as a whole is an ingratiating work. One remembers with pleasure the horseplay of the village as it prepares a reception for Andrea; the sardonic portrait of Don Franco, a "modern" priest whose only passion is for public works; the cleverness of the conversations between Andrea and the wary peasants. But reading Silone makes one greedy, particularly for the richness of incident and feeling that one found in his early books.

A man with Silone's capacity for telling stories ought to allow his talent to flow freely, even capriciously. That he tells the stories will be guarantee enough of their importance.

¡VIVA

JOSE GARCIA VILLA,
Who
Was born in Manila, the Philippines, the son of a physician
Who
Was the chief of staff for General Aguinaldo
In the Philippine revolution against Spain,
Who
Presently teaches the poetry writing course at the City College in New York, and whose
Early interest was in painting, but
Who
Later, however, felt that he was more suited to the medium
Of poetry, and whose
First book of poetry, *Have Come, Am Here,* received instant
And resounding critical acclaim, and whose
New volume, *Selected Poems and New,* has been published by
McDowell, Obolensky, Inc.,
New York, N. Y., with a preface by Dame
Edith Sitwell, to whom

Poem No. 158 ("A Valentine for Edith Sitwell, *Neglect, me,*
and, believe, me, and, caress, me")
Is dedicated, and who
In praising Villa's poems, in the space of four
And one half pages,
Quotes Blake, Novalis, Boehme, St. Catherine of Genoa, Meister
Eckhart, Mallarmé,
Coleridge, Dr. Jung, Rulard, Goethe, and John Ray, the great
Seventeenth Century Naturalist, who
Asked, "What is the use of Butterflies?" as well as Villa,
The best of whose
Poems are, she says, "amongst the most beautiful written in
Our time," — Villa, whose

Genius expresses itself in fiery spiritual outbursts, and
Who
Is a literary experimenter, whose
Experiment in his first book was "reversed
Consonance," a new method of rhyming
Which
Is "subtler and stricter, and less obtrusive on the ear, than
Ordinary consonance," the second of which
Was, in *Volume Two,* a new, special
And *poetic* use of the comma: "Somewhat, there, is, somewhere,/
Where, is, somehow, somewho . . . " and
Whose

Third experiment, introduced in the present volume, is called
"Adaptations," which
Are poems: from prose, of which
This is one, a "collage," taken from *Life* magazine, 1951:
"The medieval tea-/
Sipping ascetic Zen Buddhists drank/
Tea simply to/
Stay awake during/ Their long hours of meditation./ Zen,
Who
Was/ Their founder, was/ Also their zenith: He sat nine years/
In abstract/
Meditation: sip/ ping tea, till his leg withered and/
Fell off." — an experiment
Which

Has held Villa's special attention since he first tried
It out in 1951, and which
Has held mine for the past twenty minutes, this review
Being an "adaptation"
Into poetry: from prose
Of the dustjacket, preface, and notes of *Selected Poems And New,* which
Contains 236 pages, and sells for
$5.00!
¡Viva!

WILLIAM JAY SMITH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dixie, My Dixie

by Gerald W. Johnson

CRITICISM of the South by Southerners —excluding the asinity of Thomas Dixon, on one side, and Howard Fast, on the other—falls into two main types, analogous to clinical examination and therapeutic treatment in medicine. The great diagnosticians were the ancient Hinton Rowan Helper and the modern W. J. Cash. The therapeutists appeared fifty years ago in Edgar Gardner Murphy, of Alabama, who now has an able successor in James McBride Dabbs, of South Carolina.

The Southern Heritage, by James McBride Dabbs (Knopf; $4).

Dabbs cannot quite match the eloquence of Murphy, but he has the advantage of vastly more data; therefore he represents almost as great an advance over Murphy as Cash was over Helper. Dabbs has read such historians as Woodward and Ulrich Phillips and he has studied carefully the brilliant school of sociologists at the University of North Carolina—Odum, Vance, Guy Johnson and the rest. Nevertheless, his regimen is the same as that recommended by Murphy, and originally devised by neither, but by Booker T. Washington, to wit, if the Southern white man will quit sitting on the Negro, they can both climb out of the gutter.

Dabbs' analysis of the policy of racial segregation is as destructive as carbolic acid is to a streptococcus, yet it is based on nothing more mysterious than the historians' records, the statistical tables and observations with the naked eye. What makes it extraordinary is that Dabbs is a South Carolinian who nevertheless believes "that grass is green, lakes damp, and mountains steep." That is to say, he is a realist in a realm given over to fantasy for ninety years and more.

However, he is a Southerner and cannot bring himself to make the most of his main point, which is that the policy of segregation was not devised against the Negro *qua* Negro, but as a weapon suited to the rapacity and dishonesty of the Wool-Hat Boys, on the one hand, and the Bourbons, on the other. Yet it is of record that before segregation the Negro was caressed and cajoled by Tom Watson, the agrarian rebel, and Wade Hampton, the arrogant aristocrat. Each had the idea that the other intended to use the Negro to rob, exploit and humiliate the opposing element of the whites. Both were right, and their warfare became so murderous that eventually they agreed to outlaw this weapon, as the nations are now hoping to outlaw the atomic bomb. The destruction of the Negro that this involved was incidental.

Dabbs points out that when a man erects a cynicism into a great moral principle he may convince himself, but only at the price of a split personality. In the end, he becomes a moral imbecile, really unable to distinguish right from wrong. This is the disaster that has overtaken a great many Southerners including, unfortunately, virtually all politicians, and many educated and influential people.

This writer, however, is hopeful. Segregation is devilishly expensive and inconvenient and more and more Southerners are realizing how great a handicap it is. Industrialization, which Mr. Dabbs distrusts and dislikes, is nevertheless forcing realization of the facts upon the South. He makes the curious observation that the Wool-Hat Boys seem to be realizing it faster than the privileged classes and suspects that the current excitement is an effort to "whip up enthusiasm for an attitude no longer deeply believed in."

All of which is interesting, and much of which is highly plausible, which would seem to make this an important and prophetic book. But a doubt lingers. Is the attitude of the South, after all, the determining factor? It is beyond belief that the wobbly course of the President on this issue was dictated by fear of Governor Faubus. It is much more likely that Mr. Eisenhower retreated because he became convinced that the North and West would not support him in vigorous and resolute action.

If this is the case, what Mr. Dabbs says hardly matters. Truthful he is. Pious he is—maybe a little too pious. Sincere and eloquent he is. But for all that, he may be, like Murphy and Cash before him, merely a voice crying in the wilderness.

MOVIES

Wilder But Not Funnier

"ALL THE PARTS were acted to perfection," wrote Sir Richard Steele of a play in 1709; "the actors were careful of their carriage." An age conscious of its style naturally considered bearing important in its players, and the players obviously knew it and responded. But what happens when actors who live in an age uninterested in style, whose training has not included past styles, are asked to perform stylistically?

The Matchmaker (Paramount).

You can see the sad answer in the current film of Thornton Wilder's *The Matchmaker*. Mr. Wilder understood the style in which he was writing—that of, say, Pinero's *The Magistrate*—but, to take nothing from him, it is easier for a writer to know his models and follow them than for an actor. There are a few good actors in this picture, but only one of them has a glimmer of the necessary style; and the director, Joseph Anthony, himself a capable actor, has been unable to supply the need. The result is that what should be crisp and pointed is soggy and limp. *The Matchmaker* is based on a play by the Austrian Johann Nestroy (1842) in turn taken from an English play by John Oxenford (1835). Further, Wilder did a first version of it which was presented twenty years ago as *The Merchant of Yonkers*.

The present play, which has been performed in London and New York, takes place in the eighties, deals with the efforts of a widow named Dolly Gallagher Levi to live by her wits and tells how, by seeming to arrange a marriage in New York for a rich Yonkers merchant, she snares him for herself. Confluent with this story is that of two young clerks in the merchant's store who secretly go to New York on the same day as their employer and accidentally get involved with several ladies whom he knows. There are many sturdy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

complications, hidings in closets and under tables, soliloquies and asides. Wilder says he wrote it as a parody of the plays he saw in his youth, but it is so good that it is a parody of life instead. He also says that it is "about the aspirations of the young (and not only the young) for a fuller, freer participation in life." This seems wishful hindsight; the play is simply a theatre piece susceptible of being very amusing if it is played straight—which is to say, as actors of the eighties would have played it.

The film-script by John Michael Hayes condenses and alters the original but not in any outrageous fashion; it is the director and actors who fail it. How do we know that they fail it, how do we know what acting styles of the past were? The truth is that we don't know, absolutely, but strong clues exist. First, in this instance, actors survived from the eighties well into our times, were seen by some of us, and were certainly seen by many actors and directors working today. Second, experienced and imaginative readers of plays (an unfortunately small group even in the theatre) can, by acquainting themselves with the drama of the time, infer a good deal about methods of performance. Third, the dramatic critics and biographers of the past, though often unreliable judges of plays, were equally often keen and articulate connoisseurs of acting. (William Winter's opinions of new plays are valueless; his descriptions of Booth make that actor live for us.) The distillation of these things, added to the elements that would apply in any criticism, is what convinces us that Shirley Booth has just put down her cigarette and switched off her portable radio before walking on to the set of this film.

Miss Booth has in the past demonstrated certain gifts: the ability to make you feel that she is pathetically lovable, tolerant, and good-hearted. But these are limited gifts, whether used in the drama of *Come Back, Little Sheba* or the comedy of *The Desk Set;* and these limitations, combined with a voice of unvarying nasal timbre, have ranked her, in my view, as a useful supporting actress, not the star she has become. It may be that her eminence is due not only to the flatness of the surrounding country but also reflects the desire in the contemporary audience merely to feel neighborly identification with its players. We do not demand heroic heroines, Ethel Barrymores, Margaret Anglins; we are satisfied with the *petit bourgeois* idol. There have always been such, of course, but the rise of the don't-worry-I'm-not-a-bit-better-than-you-are star is perhaps a concomitant of the sometimes lamented rise of the anti-hero in our novels.

Miss Booth as Dolly is bereft of any idea of how to handle the part in period; she keeps trying to break it down into contemporary terms more comfortable for her. Where the lines need to be sustained and arched, she chops them into bite-size phrases. Where a scene needs high attack and witty, bright teasing of others, herself, and the situation, Miss Booth fumbles for appeal like a poor but nice cousin visiting rich relatives. She has some good moments, but that is simply because she is experienced enough to bend some of the part to her will, never because she really gets into the part.

If Miss Booth is a competent actress miscast, Paul Ford as the merchant is an amateur let loose in VistaVision. In very restricted bumbly roles, Ford has been moderately effective on stage and television, but he has always been a cartoon actor without even sound cartoon technique. Put into a role that calls not only for technique but a highly specialized one, Ford is simply pitiful.

Anthony Perkins plays the older clerk with flashes of inventive *gaucherie*, but this talented young man runs the risk of infatuation with his own charm. I would also like to see him in one film or play in which he doesn't lean bashfully against walls. As the young woman he wins, Shirley MacLaine is pleasant-looking but null.

The one member of the cast who seems to me in command of his situation is Robert Morse who repeats his stage-role of the younger clerk. Morse (who is now giving a funny performance on Broadway in *Say, Darling*) has a genuine, individual comic flavor. He has the enormous concentration on trifles of a child; he takes what happens to him with an earnest ingenuousness that is winning; and he is the only one in the cast who, by reason of an uncontemporary frankness of spirit and address, approximates the flavor of the piece. Morse has a future, I think. For instance, he is the only young actor to come along in years who would seem capable of handling those perennial casting headaches: Shakespearean clowns.

In all the above comments on style is the implication (I hope) that we suffer for lack of a corps of actors trained in techniques and traditions, available for stage and screen. One of the principal reasons why French period films seem more convincing to us than ours even when we don't understand the language is because such a corps of actors exists there. Our multimillion-dollar productions cannot conceal some of our basic poverties.

STANLEY KAUFFMANN

Notes on Contributors

IRVING HOWE, during the coming year, will be a guest professor at Wayne State University. WILLIAM JAY SMITH has recently published a volume of collected poems. GERALD WEALES is a member of the English faculty of the University of Pennsylvania.

Do we need union reform?

AS UNIONS MATURE

An Analysis of the Evolution of American Unionism

by RICHARD A. LESTER

A forcefully written book about how American unions got to be what they are, where they stand now, and where they go from here. With 18 million members and a power and influence that penetrates industry, politics, community life, and even foreign trade, unions in the United States have entered a new era. Gone is much of the old militancy and zeal that characterized unions before World War II. How and why has this come about? Does the ageing of unions lead to increased stability—or to corruption and loss of vitality? This searching analysis draws upon the experience of five major U.S. unions to show what the main trends are and what they mean. $3.75

At your bookstore

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
Princeton, New Jersey

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ART

Something Old, Something New

THE Whitney Museum is, I should think, just about alone in its institutional approach to 20th Century American art. A couple of our bigger museums have what amount to by-laws against contemporary American work, but this is simply the extreme statement of an attitude of disparagement and distrust that is widespread. Where a local cache of some kind exists—Bellows in Columbus, Duveneck in Cincinnati—it is almost always the result of some accidental local connection in years gone by; and the cache is rarely exploited, expanded to cover, say, the people working at the same time as the central artist, or to explore his distinctive strain as it existed earlier and as it has continued. A few places, notably Buffalo, have gone in for abstract expressionism in a big way. The old line institutional attitude, which is probably still dominant, is that of Dostoevsky's provincial ladies, who never used their native tongue if they could remember the French of a thing.

As some of the old line institutions come under the management of serious young men in dark suits—their seniors, somehow, went in more for odd jackets, a difference of more significance than you might think— those hallowed, fake-Renaissance walls, too, come alive with the splashings and splatterings of the new men. This, of course, is an updated version of the French-of-a-thing approach and it leads to the curious conclusion that American painting never really existed until Pollock spoke.

The Whitney Museum has never shared any of these attitudes toward American art. Indeed the Museum owes its existence to those attitudes. It began only after the Metropolitan turned down the offer of the collection which had been joyfully amassed by Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney from 1908 to 1929. Through those two decades and through the several organizations that preceded the Museum, Mrs. Whitney, with the assistance of Juliana Force, took on a set of jobs that are today divided up among art museums, foundations, dealers, collectors, the art press and, for that matter, the county welfare office. Since the museum's beginning, some of these functions have been dropped and one, scholarship, has been added, but in those formative years all these various activities were not separate parts so much as different aspects of the same thing, a unifying purpose expressed in the name of the earliest Whitney organization, the Friends of the Young Artists. From that unity and diversity came the style of the Museum, a style which, in its annual exhibition, manages to infuriate one and all, and which, in the growing collection that began when Mrs. Whitney substituted purchases for prizes in the Young Artists shows, is responsible for the finest available assembly of 20th Century American.

All of this is apropos of the annual summer exhibition at the Whitney of three whole floors of painting and sculpture from the permanent collection. The Museum does this every summer and between exhibitions through the year. Every time it's done, you wish the collection could be up all the time. The reason for this reaction and the reason the collection is so fine both stem from the essentially humble style of Mrs. Whitney and Mrs. Force. Normal institutional pride leads museums to try to make history; normal institutional shrewdness leads museums to try to outguess history. The Whitney does neither. It attempts simply to supply as much material as possible so that, in its own good time, history can make up its own mind in total possession of the facts. And this historical service is merely the by-product of the overall aim of helping American art and American artists.

I RECENTLY SPENT a couple of days not doing much but loitering around the Whitney during this annual institutional retrospective. There were a lot of beautiful things on view and there was also the unmistakable impression that beautiful things are not being painted much now. It isn't the beauty that's gone, it's the things. The Whitney had a big Pollock in the window and it is undeniably beautiful, that fascinating swirl of rope and space. There was a big stark Kline with its own beauty, too, and a finicky Guston, an Ad Reinhardt now-you-see-it-now-you-don't arrangement of almost vanished rectangles in a rectangular ground. They all have beauty of a sort and they're all highly individual—in a name-the-painter quiz you couldn't miss. But while the artist's individuality is at a new high, the individuality of work is at a new low. You remember the manner, not the single work. Parts are interchangeable, much as in the novels of Thomas Wolfe, the plays of William Saroyan. And the new painting seems to flow from the sources tapped by Wolfe and Saroyan, too, the profuse strains of unpremeditated art, hot stuff for skylarks but limited and self-contradictory for humans.

The Whitney collection being what it is, the majority of the work was premeditated art, going from Bellows' strong report of the first round of the Dempsey-Firpo fight all the way down to a lovely Baizerman back of hammered copper, the tortured Lipchitz "Sacrifice" and the wonderfully inflated sex beyond sex-appeal of Gaston Lachaise.

Looking better than ever is the Whitney's great Jack Levine, "Gangster Funeral," where everything works like gears to increase and transmit a directed power over art and life.

FRANK GETLEIN

The NR Competition for younger writers

10 awards
$100 each

for

- The best essays on the state of American fiction
- The best essays on any aspect of present-day television

•

Length: 1500-3000 words

Eligibility: writer must be under 27

Deadline: October 1, 1958

•

Awards Department
The New Republic
1244 19th St., N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TELEVISION

Tonight We Agonize

For the past month or so I have been watching *Tonight*—now called *The Jack Paar Show*—with frequency. I am not a dedicated fan. In fact, I do not even care much for the show. I have been watching it the way a hypnotized frog is supposed to stare at a snake, the way a surprised chipmunk looks into the headlights of an approaching car. Fascinated and repelled, I have been trying to figure out whether or not the face that Jack Paar presents to his viewers is his own or the result of a very specialized comic technique. He strikes me as an unpleasant man; even when he is making protestations of admiration, he gives the impression of a boyish insincerity. It is not the latent aggression of his friendly moments that is disturbing, however; it is the way he attacks and having been repulsed—as so often happens, since he is slow on his feet—lapses into a defensive pettishness.

The mocking cordiality and the sudden sharp attacks could be the conscious equipment of the comic outsider who is poking holes in society at large and his own business at small. The old Henry Morgan, before he tried unsuccessfully to become amiable for television, is the best example of such a technique in operation; Groucho Marx, whose program is neither quiz nor comedy, is the only current one. If Paar is trying for such a comic stance, he fails because the aggressive comedian has to be elephant-skinned in his imperviousness, and Paar appears to be as sensitive as a wallflower at a high school dance. A whining suggestion of guess-I'll-go-eat-worms self-pity is as omnipresent on his show as the commercials. I have the feeling that Paar wants to be loved, but—unhappily—he is so seldom lovable.

I can illustrate these generalized remarks best by pointing out specific Paar habits. Let us take, first, his reaction to laughs that do not come. The bulk of his show and the best part of it is ad lib, but there are always a number of set comic bits, usually done by Paar alone. For the most part these are pathetic—tricks with ping pong balls, baby pictures, plastic hands, all labeled with supposedly hilarious captions. If one of these gags misfires or if one of the jokes in his stand-up opener does not bring a laugh, Paar is likely to stop and question the audience about its failure to be amused. This is, of course, an old comic trick. When a comedian's material falls flat, he often reaches for a laugh at his own failure; Fred Allen used to turn such defeats into ad-lib victories. With Paar, however, the old gimmick comes with a difference. There is in his voice real sorrow or, often, real annoyance that the audience has not laughed. The assumption is not that the material is bad, which it often is, but that the audience is.

His behavior in the face of laughs that do come is even more inexplicable. If the set material brings a laugh, he ordinarily and wisely goes on with the routine. Even here, however, he sometimes stops to compliment the audience for laughing, a gambit that is likely to hush a laugh even while it is building. It is the surprise laugh, the one that comes on a casual and apparently straight line, that worries him most. When such a laugh comes, he pulls up short, asks—sometimes querulously, sometimes mischievously—what is funny. Then he worries the laugh, the line, the audience, like a terrier with a rat, until all spontaneity dies. After that, leadenly the show goes on.

The relationship of Paar to his guests and the regulars on his show (a changing galaxy) is even more revelatory. His quarrel with Dody Goodman was the staple of television gossip before her exit from the show put an end to conjecture. It is the business of chatter columnists and not of critics to contemplate whether Paar is or is not genuinely at odds with the people around him. All that one can do from the living room side of the screen is to notice that there is something very real about the "pretended" petulance which follows on his being bested by a visitor. Cliff Arquette, as Charlie Weaver from Mount Idy, is one of the most talented ad-lib comedians in television. When he first began to appear on *Tonight*, in the last days of Dody Goodman, Paar seemed to welcome him warmly. There are still protestations of friendship, but increasingly Paar's remarks to Arquette have taken a personal and a bitter turn. His supposedly amiable "You're a devil, you are" sounds more and more as though he means it. He has begun to kill Arquette's laughs by repeating a line musingly or by interrupting—not as Arquette interrupts with a joke, but with a humorless irrelevancy. The interruption, in fact, seems to have become Paar's chief defensive weapon.

It is possible that the unfortunate impression that Paar makes is a calculated one, that he is casting himself as the perennially outraged butt. Jack Benny has been using such a trademark for years. With Benny, however, one is aware that his platform personality is a comic concoction. With Paar, there is too much doubt. If he is trying to do the Benny bit, he is trying too hard. I remember hearing him once go on endlessly about a wrong that someone—Betty Furness, I think—had done him several years ago when he had his unsuccessful morning show; I have often heard him expound at length about the thanklessness of show-business types.

I still have not made up my mind about what he thinks he is doing. If Paar is for real—to use a phrase that was once hung on Dody Goodman—he is not for me. If he is polishing an elaborate comic technique, he is more accomplished than he is funny. When the swords begin to cross on the show, I have a feeling that I have walked into the middle of a family quarrel. I am more embarrassed than I am amused. Well, back to the old movies.

Gerald Weales

LEARN WHILE ASLEEP! Exciting details free. Sleep-Learning Research Association, P.O. Box 24-NR, Olympia, Washington.

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! $10.95 includes duty and import charges. Delivery in ten days from receipt of order. Unconditional money back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue. Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.

FREE! Writer's Market List!
If you're interested in writing fiction or articles for leading magazines, or book publishers, Daniel S. Mead, prominent literary agent, has prepared a catalogue of markets which is a "must" item. For free copy write:
Daniel S. Mead, 915 Broadway, Dept. NR N. Y. 10, N. Y.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO 301 N ST N E WASHINGTON 2 D C 7

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Communication

(Continued from page 3)

be censored and withdrawn from public circulation.

The audience of psychiatrists, attorneys, artists, photographers, actors and writers saw seven films. All have been subpoenaed by a California legislative committee investigating obscenity and pornography in motion pictures.

The subpoena called for Raymond Rohauer, proprietor of the Coronet Theatre, to bring the films to the auditorium of the Los Angeles police administration building.

THE QUESTION the invitational audience was asked to decide, after seeing the pictures, was whether they felt they should be barred from public showing or whether they as individuals would do what they could to oppose censoring them and similar works. It was really a test of attitudes since the material was strong meat.

Stanley Fleischman, an attorney who had successfully defended Rohauer in a previous court test of the legitimacy of the Coronet's movie fare, made a brief speech before the house lights dimmed explaining that the subpoened films had been shown last June. He said the brochure listing the dates of showing had contained a paragraph criticizing the state legislature for proposed new laws "attempting to expand the areas of thought-control and to suppress freedom of expression and with it freedom of thought."

With this as an explanatory prelude I'll now list the films and describe them, though not in gory detail since I want the editor to resist his impulse to file this in the round basket beneath his desk. But first I want to say that although I found some of the subject matter quite disturbing I don't think other adults should be prevented from seeing them.

The subpoened films were: *Monkey Into Man, The Rorschach Test: Klopper Method, Experiments in the Revival of Organisms, Human Reproduction, Birth of a Child, Sex Life of the Rhesus Monkey, Le Chien Andalou,* and *El.*

We viewed them in this order and saw all of them except the last one, which Rohauer does not own.

Monkey Into Man was narrated by Sir Julian Huxley, Aldous' brother, and was completely innocuous as to sexual content or emotionally disturbing material. It compared the intelligence of the Baboon, Gibbon, Chimpanzee, Orangutan and Gorilla to that of man and showed the monkeys and apes solving various problems.

The movie of the famous Rorschach inkblot test used by psychiatrists to gain an insight into patients showed the examination of a shy young man at the hands of a rather patronizing psychiatric social worker. Superimposed drawings were used to indicate what the man saw in the cards. He saw mostly animals and fully clothed people though one card called up for him a nude woman. There was some discussion of scoring techniques but nothing here to upset anybody.

THE REVIVAL of a dead dog was shown in a Soviet film narrated by J. B. S. Haldane, an English scientist. Anyone opposed to vivisection would get the jitters at seeing a dog anesthesized and allowed to bleed to death and then brought back to life 15 minutes later by the pumping of oxygenated blood through its body.

The film also showed a dog's head, heart and lungs removed and kept alive by means of a monstrous mechanism. I suppose the medicos will be reviving human beings like this before long and it may be a good thing but I must confess this motion picture made me squirm. I found it philosophically objectionable to see doctors tampering with the fundamental mystery of life and said so during the discussion afterwards. This promptly made me the target for learned jibes and ridicule and it was explained to my satisfaction that somewhere I have acquired an anti-medical bias. When it comes to cutting up people and animals unnecessarily, this I admit.

Human Reproduction was a film I would be pleased to have my own children see at say the age of 10 or 11. Only drawings and diagrams are used in the expository parts. It opens with a boy playing around on the floor while his father and mother chat about a neighbor woman who has gone to the hospital to have a baby. The boy asks questions, the father makes a bumbling attempt to answer, a pompous voice cuts in saying, "That's right, Dad," and then the diagrams explain conception, gestation and birth.

Birth of a Child is something else again. I am the father of five children, have gone through the routine of timing contractions, driving the expectant mother to the hospital, pacing the corridors.

I have seen photographs, talked with obstreticians, read innumerable books, and for the two children born at Hollywood Presbyterian Hospital I have been in the labor room until delivery was imminent. But until I saw this film I had never seen an actual birth and my first reaction was, "It sure is messy."

The film showed normal delivery, twins by breech, delivery with forceps and Caesarean section. All except the normal delivery were harrowing to watch and this applies particularly to extraction through the abdomen. Instead of risking offending the readers of this family publication I will merely quote one sophisticated gentleman who wiped his brow when it was over and told me, "My wife had three Caesarean deliveries and this leaves me limp. I didn't realize what she had to go through."

Sex Life of the Rhesus Monkey was pretty much what the title indicated. I found it amusing but Attorney Fleischman reminded me that for some people references to sex produce as much anxiety as movies of vivisection or human operations do in me.

The Andalusian Dog, directed by Salvador Dali, was a total loss, a batch of surrealist garbage which I could take or leave with equal indifference except for one scene. This was the slitting of a woman's eyeball by a razor blade and although Rohauer assured me afterward that it wasn't a real eyeball it revolted me. If I believed in censorship of any kind I'd favor censoring that. But I suppose that people who go to movies directed by Dali must be prepared for the unpleasant, since he seems to live all by himself in a psychotic environment.

IT will be interesting to see how the rest of Los Angeles, and particularly the movie critics on the metropolitan papers, react to these films when they are shown to the public for the benefit of future lawmaking.

It is to be hoped that they will agree with those at the private showing, who seemed united in saying: "Some of this I found offensive but maybe you won't and who am I to keep you away?"

RIDGELY CUMMINGS

Hollywood

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED